

## SENSATIONAL MEMOIRS

Beria's diaries are not fake

ech

proof

## SPETSHRAN

## SENSATIONAL MEMOIRS

1089

Beria's diaries are not fake!

[6 Noah ym

MOSCOW "YAUZA-PRESS" 2012

UDC 93/94 LBC 63.3(2)

K 79

K 79

Design of the series by S. Kurbatov

Kremlinov S.

Beria's diaries are not fake! New evidence / Sergei Kremlev. - M.; Yauza-press, 2012. - 224 p. — (Spetskhron. Sensational memoirs).

T5VM 978-5-9955-0457-3

Sensational publication of personal diaries of L.P. Beria for 1938-1953. with Sergey Kremlev's commentary caused not only furious controversy on the Internet, but also a violent reaction from the historical officialdom, which hastened to declare these records a "fake" and "hoax", and their publisher - a "falsifier".

Raising the thrown glove, Kremlyov takes on the oncoming battle - and not only repulses all the attacks of the accusers, leaving no stone unturned from their "arguments" and providing new evidence of the authenticity of Beria's diaries, but he himself goes on the offensive against the Kremlin agitprop, convicting "membership mafia" in the deliberate falsification of Soviet history, the forgery of the great Stalin era and the deliberate denigration of the Leader's closest ally:

"As head of the NKVD, Beria paid much attention to the organization of archives, constantly emphasizing that without documents there are no archives, without archives there is no history, and without history there is no future. Beria created historical archives. Slanderers against Beria destroy historical archives. And they replace the documents with fakes like the "Katyn case"... " "Stalin and Beria accepted Russia < with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb. The current regime will leave us not only without a nuclear shield, but even without a plow..."

UDC 93/94 LBC 63.3(2)

© S. Kremlev, 2012

15VM 978-5-9955-0457-3 © 000 Yauza-press, 2012

## TO YURI POZDNYAKOV - WITH GRATITUDE FOR LONG-TERM FRIENDSHIP

From the author

This book was unexpected for me in the sense that I did not intend to write it. Only newly arisen circumstances became the reason that I once again had to return to the topic of Beria.

In 2011, the Yauza publishing house published three volumes of L.P.'s diaries with my comments. Beria, the great manager of socialism, an outstanding comrade-in-arms of I.V. Stalin.

Volume 1 was called "Stalin Does Not Believe in Tears", volume 2 - "I can't stand the Second War", volume 3 - "We live with the atomic bomb".

Then, with my comments, undated materials by L.P. Beria under the titles "There will be no Russia without Stalin!" and "Live another twenty years!".

Publication of diaries for 1938-1953 and other entries by L.P. Beria was met with sufficient interest, the best confirmation of which was several additional printings of all five books. However, the publication of L.P. Beria caused heated controversy in society, and the diaries were repeatedly declared fake. The Internet network was filled with statements that the diaries were "fake" (that is, fiction), but no clear arguments were given to substantiate such a statement.

I had neither time nor much need to spend time getting acquainted with the entire array of responses on the Web, and I never had. However, there were some things that got to me from time to time. Here is a typical example...

On June 11, 2011, the following message from a certain Alexander Dyukov appeared in LiveJournal (ý-ýýýýýý.ýýýýýýgpa1.ýot1031599/ýý):

Beria's diaries.

So yes.

The Yauza publishing house this year published three books of the so-called Beria's Diaries, a fake made by S. Kremlev.

Our journal needs a detailed review with an analysis of this opus.

The fee, as well as, if necessary, a copy of the three-volume book for dissection will be provided."

Judging by the fighting spirit of the "live" draft, in "LiveJournal" they do not really like either Lavrentiy Beria or Sergei Kremlev. But Beria long ago acquired the ability to look at the situation from the standpoint of Eternity, and I am not a pretty girl, and the tone of "LJ" rather amused me than depressed me.

In addition, I got acquainted with the appeal of A. Dyukov only at the end of May 2012 - almost a year after its publication. And, as I understand it, the editorial staff of LJ has no reviews, no analysis of "this opus" who did not wait.

And the fee for "exposing" the Kremlin has not yet been paid.

The fact itself is significant.

Examples can be continued, but I did not seek to enter into discussions with anyone on my own initiative. How, excuse me, the dogs don't bark, but the caravan must go...

In general, the reader took the "Diaries" kindly and interestedly, and I was quite satisfied with this. So, having prepared for publication diaries and undated materials from

secret archive of L.P. Beria, and then writing, at the request of the publisher, also my own book "If Beria had not been killed", I hoped that I had finished work on the theme of Beria, if not completely, then for a long time.

However, it turned out differently - soon I had to take up the pen again.

And, starting this, unexpected for me, super-scheduled, so to speak, book on the Beria theme, I must first of all express my sincere, although not deep and not benevolent, gratitude to Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Professor Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov. If not for his massive attention to my modest work to restore the good name of L.P. Beria, this book would never have been born...

The fact is that in issue 2 for 2012 of the Russian historical illustrated magazine Rodina (founded by the Administration of the President of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Russian Federation), an article by Professor V.P. Kozlova "Rehabilitation by forgery - "like in a movie"", where the authenticity of the diaries of L.P. Beria, prepared by me for publication and commented on.

Then, in issue 4 for 2012 of the academic journal Questions of History, the same, in fact, article was published under the title "Rehabilitation by forgery".

It was already serious, and the preparation of this or that

7

a different answer, in essence, became almost inevitable for me, although I did not at first imagine that I would give it in the form of a book, not an article.

In addition, the book owes its birth, although to a lesser extent, also to the writer of the "liberistic" direction, Dmitry Vinter. He devoted to the analysis of the diaries of L.P. Beria's own work with the title "Stalin and Beria are war criminals", published in 2012 in the same publishing house "Yauza", which published the diaries of L.P. Beria. In my opinion, it was quite a reasonable and smart step on the part of the publishing house.

Such a step was also reasonable because Winter's book is not so much an analysis (more precisely, an "analysis" in quotation marks) of diaries as a set of superficial and simply stupid reasoning of the author, which in itself characterizes him in a very definite way.

Dm. To Winter, I also express my gratitude for the impetus to write this book and also - gratitude not benevolent.

Well, this is all I can.

So, the book offered to the attention of the reader is "overlimit", I was not going to write it. Of course, the appearance of Professor Kozlov's first article in Rodina magazine obligated me to react in some way, so as not to give my critics a reason to say: "Aha! Silence is a sign of consent..."

But, I repeat, I did not expect that the answer would be so voluminous.

If we keep in mind the book of Dm. Winter, then her low, in general, level made it possible not to pay much attention to her - up to her complete disregard. Moreover, Dm. Winter, accusing Stalin, Beria, and at the same time (what an honor for me!)

Kremleva in all mortal sins, not only did not question the authenticity of the diaries of L.P. Beria, but he built all his reasoning on the basis of their authenticity.

As for Professor Kozlov's article, everything was different here. The reason that forced me to answer it was not in the level of the article as such, and not even in the status of its author, but in the level and status of those publications where the article appeared. On the Internet, there was enough and enough of scolding about diaries, but the Network is the Network, and the journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences is, whatever one may say, still the journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

In addition, the professor-historian Kozlov, in contrast to the liberal writer Winter, declared the diaries to be fake. I couldn't help but respond to something like that.

At first, I expected to give an answer to Professor Kozlov also within the framework of the article. But the article grew, new topics began to be seen ...

And after consulting with my publishers, I decided to write a book anyway.

Moreover, the question itself was fundamentally broader than the question of whether Beria's diaries are authentic.

In my opinion, much more relevant and important is the question of how much the image of the era of Stalin and Beria, which is created today in the mass consciousness by both the media and historians, corresponds to historical truth and irrefutable documents.  
academicians.

I must say right away that, in general, the role of the semi-official Russian "historical" "science" in the forgery of the Stalin era is so unattractive that it is just right to talk about the moral criminality of many academic and so on. structures.

Ignorance of the law does not exempt from responsibility for its violation, but how much higher is the responsibility of those who, not only knowing, but also establishing laws, violate them themselves! And this is precisely what we are seeing today in the realm of history.

History must be studied by historians. It is on them that society entrusts the task of finding historical truth and restoring the true picture of the past. To write history, to give its objective normative reconstruction, is not only a professional right, but also a professional duty of historians.

What do we actually have?

Beria, heading the NKVD, paid much attention to the organization of archives, constantly emphasizing that without documents there are no archives, without archives there is no history, and without history there is no future.

Beria created historical archives.

Slanderers against Beria destroy historical archives.

And they replace the documents with fakes.

This is the main current problem in the knowledge of history - the absence of a huge number of professional historians of the desire for truth against the backdrop of documentary falsification of history.

Moreover, the higher the official status of a historian, the more pronounced, as a rule, is his disregard for the truth for the sake of personal interests, on the one hand, and his readiness for direct falsification of history, on the other hand. To be convinced of this, it is enough to analyze the same historical journals Rodina and Voprosy istorii.

Yes, semi-official historians lie time after time, and so I found it necessary to raise the gauntlet

and accept a "meeting battle", accusing academicians of the undoubted forgery of the Stalin era, of distorting its historical appearance and essence.

In my new book, I included not only a detailed answer to Professor Kozlov and a number of comments on the book by Dm. Winter, but also touched upon the question of a possible textual analysis of the diaries of L.P. Beria, according to the type of analysis that was undertaken in order to establish the true author of the novel *Quiet Flows the Don*.

Let me remind you that at one time the authorship of Mikhail Sholokhov was called into question, and in the 80s the honor of Sholokhov was defended by Swedish and Norwegian linguists, undertaking a special study.

Now, on the contrary, some attribute the authorship of Beria's Diaries to Sergei Kremlev and deny Beria's authorship. Well, the methods of honest analysis have been developed for a long time, and no one has been ordered the opportunity for new research.

Work on the book was in full swing when I also had in my hands a "fresh" edition of 2012, a collection of documentary materials on the "Beria case". Since the compilers of the collection directly related the declassification of part of the investigative materials, etc. on this "case" with the publication of Beria's diaries, I found it necessary to acquaint the reader with my impressions from the collection of "Beria" documents published under the general editorship of O.B. Mozokhin.

Since my book is not large in volume, I considered it appropriate and convenient to divide it not into chapters, but into themes - eight topics, in one way or another related to the main theme of Beria's diaries.

eleven

Beria's Diaries is not fake. Attempts to depict the era of Stalin and Beria as a time of dark terror, and the two great sons of Russia and Georgia as a tyrant and his satrap, turn out to be fake.

Beria's Diaries tell about the past, but make you think about the present.

Above all, they are valuable for our possible future.

Sergei Brezkun (Kremlin)

Topic 1

NOT A FORGE, BUT A DOCUMENT Answer to Professor and Corresponding Member Kozlov

This small book has several topics, so, as already mentioned, I divided it not into chapters, but into topics.

And the first of the topics should, of course, be the topic of the answer to the professor and corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the famous historian Kozlov. It is to his articles (more precisely, to the article) that this book owes its appearance to the world, so it is with the analysis of his article that we must begin. .

Analyzing Professor Kozlov's article, I do not intend to give only an answer on the merits of those questions raised in popular and scientific periodicals by Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Professor V.P. Kozlov after the publication of the personal diaries of L.P. Beria. Willingly or unwittingly, V.P. Kozlov touched upon a number of such points, about which it would be better for him to remain silent.

Therefore, in my analysis of the text of Professor Kozlov, I also include some of my thoughts, generated by reading an article by an academician I respect (no more, however, than within the framework of epistolary politeness).

At the same time, I will say right away that if I had any doubts that the authentic diaries of L.P. Beria and his other materials, the "critical" "analysis" of these diaries by V.P. Kozlov finally strengthened my conviction that Beria's diaries are not a fake, but a document of the era.

The fact is that Professor Kozlov did not cite a single fact or example that establishes the authenticity of L.P. Beria is in doubt. In fact, V.P. Kozlov limited himself to just reasoning and conjectures - for nothing that he repeatedly presents his conjectures as proven statements.

However, about everything - in order.

And I will start, perhaps, with some preliminary explanations.

The very fact of active academic attention to my work on the publication of the diaries of L.P. Beria not so much flattered me as intrigued me, especially considering that the first publication of the article appeared almost a year after the publication of the first volume of the diaries.

For example, on the Internet, a heated discussion flared up immediately. However, forums on the Web are not always distinguished by a sufficient professional, educational and intellectual level. For one balanced and enlightened opinion, there are plenty of simply stupid and militantly ignorant ones, so assessments like "This cannot be, because it can never be" did not discourage me.

Of course, both I and my publishers, even before the publication of the diaries, understood that the lack of a publisher even one photocopy of the original (not to mention

14

the original itself) immediately gives reason to quite objective analysts to question the authenticity of the diaries. After all, I myself began with doubts and emphasized this in the prefaces to all volumes, starting from the first, where the whole story (really, I do not argue, semi-detective) of the appearance in my possession of an electronic copy of L.P. Beria was described in the most detail.

Also, more than once I emphasized that I would only be grateful to those who would undertake the work of a qualified textual and historical analysis of the diaries. I worked hard on the analysis of the texts provided to me, and only after a very considerable effort did I decide to publish them. However, being neither a Muscovite, nor a textual linguist, nor a professional historian, and indeed having no normal working conditions at all, I could not perform the work of analysis to the extent that I wanted it and what was objectively necessary.

Therefore, Professor Kozlov's article naturally interested me. V.P. Kozlov is known as a scholar specializing, among other things, in the analysis of historical hoaxes, and I hoped to find weighty pros or cons in his publication. Alas, the title of the article already alerted me, but the content, to put it bluntly, disappointed me.

But why did such an abundance of "revealing" "academic" materials suddenly appear so long after the publication of not only the first, but even the last volume of the diaries?

I do not rule out that the chest opens like this ...

It can be assumed that some people were alarmed by the success of the diaries with the reading public (and it turned out to be obvious!). And at first semi-official, and then academic

15

The scientific publication of Professor Kozlov's article should have somehow neutralized the positive impression that inevitably arises when one gets acquainted with the notes of L.P. Beria and intensifies, I venture to say, after getting acquainted with the already absolutely reliable historical information that is contained in my notes and comments.

In the case when you feel historical correctness behind you (and I, like any person brought up with good quality in the Soviet era, feel it behind me), a full-fledged discussion with any opponent is not difficult.

However, the correspondence discussion has the inevitable feature that it requires a considerable amount of printed space to ensure the completeness of the answer. Indeed, in order to answer the opponent, one must first bring his theses, and only then analyze them. Nevertheless, I will construct my direct answer to Professor Kozlov exactly as required not by printed norms, but by the completeness of the discussion, and I hope that readers, especially those who are familiar with the publication of diaries, will not tire of the volume of my answer and the subsequent general accompanying reflections.

The text of Professor Kozlov's article is given according to the version published on the Internet (Vlr: // todpaua-  
yŷyŷyŷygy / yŷyŷy.yŷy/yŷrotoraŷyŷyŷy-i- ŷRESIA1ŷyŷ-yŷyogŷyŷyŷyŷy-paiki/yŷyŷyŷykoŷyŷyŷyŷy / yŷy Yuŷyŷasŷua-  
royiorot-Kak-u-Kŷpo.ŷŷ)).

Below, the text of Professor Kozlov's article is highlighted with wider margins and smaller font, all bold italics in citations are mine. Since the order in which Professor Kozlov's theses and arguments are cited strictly corresponds to the structure of his article, the subject

my analysis is not

16

always from the first lines are its most significant places, which I pay attention to right away, so as not to incur the accusation of "digging into the details".

The article starts like this:

"Publication of L.P. Beria in three books, it seemed, should have become a sensational event in the documentary coverage of a significant part of the history of the USSR of the Stalin era ... It turns out that one of the closest associates of I.V. Stalin led during 1937-1953. diary, calling him "friend".

A trifle, but - indicative. For a person unfamiliar with the text of the diaries, such a detail (the diary nickname "friend") can create the appearance of L.P. Beria as a person prone to certain sentiments against the background of alleged butchery. But the word "druzhok" in relation to the diary was used by its author two or three times over the course of fifteen years.

Further:

"To him (the diary. - S.K.) he trusted not only his purely personal thoughts, but also records of the major events in the history of the USSR, the discussion and adoption of the most important political decisions that determined Soviet history at the same time, and even the highest state military secret of the country - the creation of the atomic bomb.

In my comments, I especially emphasized that in those parts of the diary where L.P. Beria deals with atomic topics, he is very careful and, as a rule, uses allegory or code designations, and this is explained by the special discipline of thinking that the author of the diary has been developing for decades.

17

And again - Professor Kozlov:

"...Is this possible, asks S. Kremlev, publisher and commentator of Beria's Personal Diary? And it gives a positive answer to this question, which inevitably arises in every reader of this documentary historical source. And we must agree that such a possibility cannot be ruled out. Diaries were kept by high-ranking tsarist dignitaries of the 19th and early 20th centuries, and even the last Russian Emperor Nicholas I himself was no stranger to this hobby. True, they were mostly intellectual dignitaries who wanted to record history through the prism of their perception of what was happening. And here is just a really effective "Stalinist manager", a pragmatist who thought more about the goal than about the means to achieve it, especially about time. And the time was not tsarist — documents of this kind (which Beria knew firsthand) happened to become evidence not of time, but of accusations. However, everything could be — the therapy of the soul with the help of personal diaries is a well-known phenomenon and independent of the official, political and public hierarchy of their authors..."

What can be said about Professor Kozlov's reasoning regarding the fact that personal diaries were supposedly more natural for high-ranking royal dignitaries of the 19th and early 20th centuries, including for such an "intellectual" as Emperor Nicholas II, and not for "Stalinist manager" and pragmatist, allegedly "thinking more about the goal than about the means to achieve it"?

Firstly, Professor Kozlov speaks so highly of the tsar's dignitaries and their crowned leader in vain. And even less, Professor Kozlov has reasons not to

That

18

highly appreciate the level and inner world of Stalin's comrades-in-arms.

The tsarist "intellectuals" in the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, despising the people, provided Russia with only total backwardness (which is proved by statistics), progressive debt bondage and mediocre conflicts in the Far East and Europe.

And Stalin and the "Stalinist managers" within only ten years after the devastation of two wars, together with the people, made Russia the first power in Europe.

It's a fact!

Secondly, quite reliable, now published documents, including those of the Atomic Project of the USSR, prove that L.P. Beria, like I.V. Stalin thought about the means to achieve the goal quite a lot and chose, as a rule, quite worthy and historically determined means.

Thirdly, their goals were quite worthy, which is proved primarily by the statistics of the Stalinist era, including the social one, which Professor Kozlov cannot be unaware of, just as he cannot be unaware of the existence of diaries of a number of countries. statesmen of the USSR in the time of Stalin.

They were not afraid to keep diaries then - if they dealt with state problems, and not politics.

tic tricks.

However, further on the "bull" is taken by the professor "by the horns" and states:

"... already the "Preface of the Publisher", which tells the story of the acquisition by him (me. - S.B.) of Beria's "Personal Diary", raises not only doubts about its authenticity, but also gives rise to a confident hypothesis about what is before us fake, i.e. falsified for some reason, a documentary historical source.



So, already at the beginning of the article, even before the communication of any considerations and remarks on the merits, anticipating both analysis and synthesis, Professor Kozlov, in fact, draws a conclusion ("confident hypothesis") that we are dealing with forgery. Such a statement from the lips of a serious scientist looks—let it be allowed for me to express a confident hypothesis—as evidence not of an objective approach, but of the fulfillment, for one reason or another, of some unscrupulous social order. Genuine confidence, on the other hand, is usually the result of the analysis, and not its prerequisite.

Professor Kozlov writes:

"Near the Kremlin, in the Alexander Garden, on a bench after a strange (I didn't find anything strange in it! - S.K.) conversation (diary. - S.B.) in 2008, the gray-haired old man "Pavel Lavrentievich" gives the Kremlin Speaking on behalf of a certain group of like-minded people (the pronoun "we" constantly sounds in his speech), he praises the Kremlin's book "Beria. The Best Manager of the 20th Century", published in 2007, and this explains the transfer of Beria's "Personal Diary" to him for publication.

In the Kremlin's program, it sounds like this: "... after reading your Beria, I realized that at last a book has appeared that allows you to put everything in its place. I like your position, Sergei Tarasovich, you wrote deeply and boldly about Beria. I would say that you wrote about Beria in the style of Beria, who did not tolerate wagging around the bush... And I decided that I would not find a better option than you. We want you not only to publish these diaries, but to thoughtfully prepare them for publication and comment on them" (vol. 1, p. 9)..."

Well, that's right, that's the way it was. And even Professor Kozlov does not deny that nothing is impossible in the situation I have described, and he graciously agrees:

"... Well, it's quite a normal thing: a like-minded person entrusted the Kremlin to publish Beria's "Personal Diary" without any conditions. He is old and, although he is still capable of a firm handshake and clarity of thought, he is no longer able to prepare this documentary historical source for publication. That is why "Pavel Lavrentievich" gives his interlocutor, like-minded thinker, "an electronic copy of the diaries." The reader, like the Kremlin, must inevitably think that scanned copies of the original of Beria's "Personal Diary" are transmitted, which will make it possible to establish their authenticity by the author's handwriting. But it turns out that Kremlev became the owner of only scans of a typewritten copy of the original pages of the Personal Diary, made by no one knows who and when.

Alas, it turns out that Professor Kozlov inattentively read my preface to the first volume and therefore made a certain assertion that does not correspond to reality. But more on that later, for now let's get back to my opponent's train of thought:

"The future publisher (that is, I. — S.K.) of this documentary historical source, who, of course, is familiar with the elementary rules of archeography and documentary source studies, demonstrates his distrust of the authenticity of the electronic copy of the typewritten copy of the original. And then "Pavel Lavrentievich" shows him photocopies of the original. "I hope," he says at the same time, "you are familiar enough with the handwriting of Lavrenty Pavlovich to make sure that the handwriting of the author of the diary is similar to Beria's. Of course, you are not a graphologist, but this is at least some additional guarantee for you" (vol. 1, p. 7). Kremlyov reports that after looking at the photocopies, he "saw a familiar hand." Excellent, photocopies of the original should be the test base for the accuracy of the transmission of the text in the electronic copy of the typewritten copy. But, alas, "Pavel Lavrentievich" on behalf of his friends told the Kremlin that "we ... do not

we have the opportunity to give you permanently neither a photocopy, nor a photocopy, nor a scan of a photocopy" (vol. 1, p. 8). Question: why? "Pavel Lavrentievich" explains: "There are notes, archival legends and other signs that may become significant for overly curious subjects. But he doesn't need it" (vol. 1, p. 8). Kremlev demonstrates perseverance: "And the originals

are they available somewhere now? he asks his interlocutor. And he receives a dry answer: "I can't tell you that either" (vol. 1, p. 8) ... "

In this passage, Professor Kozlov repeats his erroneous statement again, and it is time to explain to the reader what exactly Professor Kozlov's mistake is.

I must grieve (and perhaps please with an extra "proof") the respected professor, but he, I repeat, did not read the prefaces to the volumes of the diary very carefully.

Nowhere do I speak of "scans of a typewritten copy of the originals".

I received exactly the electronic version of the diaries, that is, only the text typed really by no one knows who and when, already on the computer. Photocopies of the original, and not a typewritten copy, I just held in my hands. But these were precisely photocopies of the handwritten original.

In fact, I received only a future printer printout of the text of the diaries, which, perhaps, is quite understandable.

If my, as Professor Kozlov puts it, "like-minded people" had access to the originals with the ability to make photocopies from them, then they naturally made photocopies from the diaries, and did not engage in tedious retyping of the text on a typewriter.

It is also natural that if, for one reason or another, they did not want to give photocopies to other hands, then they had to transfer the text to another - modern - information carrier, which they did.

At the same time, their work was, as I understand it, not so voluminous. After all, the original text of L.P. Beria (there were not only dated diary entries, but also undated entries of various kinds "in bulk", separately published already in 2012 as an addition to the diaries), makes up a significantly smaller part in all three volumes than my comments - Tarii, extended notes, etc.

I remind you once again: "Pavel Lavrentievich", who remained unknown to me (this, of course, was an underlined "shifter" of Beria's name and patronymic - Lavrenty Pavlovich) only showed me photocopies of a number of sheets of the original, but refused to give them to me.

Such reluctance, of course, alarmed and embarrassed me, but not at all because, as Professor Kozlov writes, "photocopies of the original [were] to become a test base for the accuracy of text transmission in an electronic copy of a typewritten copy."

First, I remind you that there was no "electronic copy of a typewritten copy", but only an electronic version of the text. But is there any doubt that the photocopies and the electronic version would have matched exactly to the typographical errors of the set?

No, it was precisely the anticipation of the emergence of "certain hypotheses" about the falsity of the diaries that bothered me, first of all, if I could not provide at least part of the photocopies. However, "Pavel Lavrentievich" simply presented me with a fact, and what

23

he was guided by — I can basically only guess, although he described in sufficient detail in the preface to the first volume of the diaries some of the motives of "Pavel Lavrentievich" — both those expressed by him and those I assumed.

Looking ahead, I can notify the reader that on the topic of why the texts of L.P. The Berias were handed over to me in the same way as they were handed over to me, we will talk more later separately - when considering the seventh topic.

Now I'll just say that even if photocopies of the original were given to me, then the "reviewers" would then, most likely, still state that these were fakes, because the examination is carried out on the originals.

Professor Kozlov states:

"Strange: all these "notes, archival legends and other signs" need not be removed from the "scan" of photocopies of Beria's "Personal Diary" in order to certify its authenticity in handwriting."

But, firstly, there was no "scan" of photocopies, but there were photocopies themselves, clearly printed not on Kodak, but on very old, at least in my unenlightened opinion, photographic paper.

Secondly, was it worth the "garden fence" if you do not conduct an authentic examination?

And thirdly, I "carried out a documentary publication" of the diaries, confirming - at least for myself - their authenticity not "by reference," as Professor Kozlov claims, and no small, I assure everyone, work on reconciling the chronology and facts noted in the diary with the exact date

24

bathed and documented historical events.

I had to work with dozens of sources and thousands of documents, but not in order to use them to write Beria's diaries. I had to make a lot of efforts in order to: a) establish, if possible, the authenticity of the texts transmitted to me and b) understand the essence of the records, etc., and after that, to the best of my understanding, comment on them and provide notes.

Why, the truth of history is often recorded not only in historical papers. It is fixed in the material, cultural and moral results of a particular era.

I also took them into account in the analysis.

However, I will dwell on this in more detail later, when considering the eighth topic "Historians-academics against historical truth", and now I will return to the analysis of Professor Kozlov, who writes:

"So, from the story of the Kremlin, we can build the following matrix of the existence of Beria's "Personal Diary" before its publication. In some archive, obviously not personal, but state or departmental, the original, i.e. written by Beria himself, the manuscript of his diary. Some group of people once managed to make photocopies of most of it. Kremlev argues about this as follows: "There could well be people who were loyal to Beria, had access to the papers confiscated from him and took steps to copy them in case they were destroyed by the Khrushchevites or other scoundrels" (vol. 1, p. . 8). These photocopies were typewritten. An electronic copy of this typewritten copy was given to the Kremlin by the mysterious "Pavel Lavrentievich". In this five-dot matrix, every point is a question ..."

That's for sure! There were enough and enough questions, but that's bad luck - some of Professor Kozlov's questions turn out to be, alas, incorrect.

So, to his questions: "Where is the typewritten copy of the diary, who and when made it? Why didn't Kremlev present at least as an illustration a part of the electronic copy of the typewritten copy of the diary?" - there are no answers simply because, as already mentioned, I did not even hold a typewritten copy of the diary in my hands, I held in my hands only a part of the photocopies of the original.

I think that a typewritten copy has never existed in nature for a reason, I have already above indicated (there was simply no need for a typewritten copy, since it was possible to simply re-take the original).

But here is the question of Professor Kozlov: "Where is the original of Beria's Personal Diary kept?" more than appropriate.

But really - where is the original of Beria's diary, and many other, definitely authentic, historical documents that inevitably had to remain after Beria?

Beria, a major Caucasian Chekist, party leader of the Transcaucasus and Georgia, People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR, Deputy Council of People's Commissars and Council of Ministers of the USSR, member of the State Defense Committee and Deputy Chairman of the GKO, Chairman of the Special Committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR ...

After all, the total body of documents from the complete archive of Beria is, perhaps, tens of thousands documents!

So where are they, these tens of thousands of documents?

After all, they definitely existed, but do they exist?

After all, the respected (no more, however, within the limits of epistolary politeness) Professor Kozlov cannot but know that at first the Khrushchevites, and then the "perestroikas" like the general from the falsification of Volkogonov, physically destroyed many archival documents, thereby committing gravest crimes against the people and history.

Beria said that without documents there are no archives, without archives there is no history, and without history there is no future. And just in order to deprive Russia of the future, it, from a certain moment, became deprive of history, and before that they thoroughly cleaned the archives, in some cases "replenishing" them forged "documents".

Therefore, I will answer Professor Kozlov's question as follows: "I don't know where the original of Beria's Personal Diary is stored or was kept, but I think that it is or was located in the same place where still not declassified investigative files on a conspiracy, for example, Tukhachevsky and others documents justifying Stalin, where falsified volumes of "investigative affairs" of Beria and many other documents of the era of Stalin and Beria, showing her true appearance in all its unimagined tragedy and undoubted greatness.

After all, this era was watered first of all with the blood of the conscious sacrifice of the heroes and then of creation, and today only dirt is left to us from it.

And yet - the ashes from the original documents of that era, destroyed by its falsifiers.

Therefore, unlike Professor Kozlov, it did not seem strange to me that "Pavel Lavrentievich" categorically dismissed any possibility of holding a "state" "expertise" of this important

27

the most important document on the grounds that there is no state in Russia today...

And isn't that right? What, is it a real state, in its full and socially prosperous content, do we have?

The importance of the state is now maximally belittled by its official "pillars", so why already there?!

However, I will talk about this in more detail later, but for now - another article by Professor Kozlov. He doubted the authenticity of the text of the diaries of L.P. Beria and argues in what seems to be an academic manner:

"In Russian, the word "legend" has many meanings. First of all, it means a tradition, an unreliable narration. But already at the turn of the XIX - XX centuries. in documentary source studies and archaeography in Russia, this word began to designate certain explanations that are obligatory when publishing a documentary historical source — indications of its place of storage, originality or copies, the history of its existence and discovery, etc. — everything that certifies authenticity, i.e. first of all, the authenticity of the published documentary historical source, even if in the end it turns out to be unreliable.

That's the academic approach!

It turns out that a scientist-historian first declares that a mandatory criterion for the reliability of a historical source is an indication of its place of storage, originality or copies, the history of its existence and discovery, etc. - everything that certifies authenticity, and then informs that, despite the presence of all these archaeological

conditions, the source may eventually be unreliable.

Fun approach!

But further - more! Professor Kozlov states:

"The verbose "archaeographic" legendization of Beria's "Personal Diary", undertaken by the Kremlin, is in fact not a legend in its archaeological sense, but a legend in its main interpretation as an unreliable narrative, worse than that, a conscious and deliberate lie. . In other words, the hypothesis that Beria's "Personal Diary" is a documentary falsification receives strong confirmation..."

So, based on the absence in my publication of those archaeological data that, according to the reviewer himself, do not guarantee reliability, the reviewer concludes that the diaries are unreliable, and Kremlev is a liar.

Oh well...

Let us note, by the way, that in the eyes of Professor Kozlov, the Kremlin is not a hoaxer, like Prosper Merimee with his Tuzla or J. Macpherson with his Poems of Ossian (if we take examples from literature), not the original historiographer Sandre de Courtille with his fake "Memoirs of d'Artagnan", namely a liar.

The definition is strong, and I don't think I deserve it. After all, an attentive and objective reader of my prefaces, afterwords and comments on the diaries of L.P. Beria can easily be convinced that I only assumed the authenticity of their text, and did not state it categorically! Professor Kozlov, on the other hand, claims that "... The Kremlin, together with" Pavel Lavrentievich "offers chi

those who want to believe in the authenticity of Beria's "Personal Diary..."

And here, as they say, I'm sorry! Neither I nor "Pavel Lavrentievich" offered anything like this to anyone, and this is clear from the article of the most respected professor Kozlov, where the following is said:

"..." Pavel Lavrentievich "advises Kremlev:" Take what I give you, if you wish, and compare the chronology, psychology, factology and whatever you like in the manuscript with known historical facts, And decide for yourself - whether it is authentic or not" (vol. 1, p. 10).

As you can see, no one assured me of anything. On the contrary, I was advised to do my own careful analysis of the text for my own conclusion about its reliability. What I was doing for a very long time, comparing the chronology and factology of the diaries with known historical facts and gradually coming to the conclusion that I was dealing, most likely, with an authentic text. At the same time, I invited everyone who wanted to join the analysis of the diaries.

Professor Kozlov did this, but how convincingly and correctly did he do it? He's writing:

"Well, let's listen to the advice of Pavel Lavrentievich and go through the pages of Beria's Personal Diary with a pencil in hand, comparing his notes with really authentic documentary sources."

And further:

"The most important of them, one might say the key one, are the published "Notebooks (journals) of records of persons accepted by I.V. Stalin" in 1924 - 1953. (Further -

Stalin's Journals) is a genuine and reliable documentary source. Stalin's journals gave the falsifier an accurate chronology of Stalin's receptions of Beria for 1938-1953, and it is the records about this that form the basis of the "Personal Diary".

Professor Kozlov is breaking through an open door here, since I have repeatedly referred specifically to Stalin's Journals and just from a comparison of L.P. Beria with information from the "Journals" began to analyze the diaries. But here is the reviewer's statement that it was the records of L.P. Beria in Stalin's office allegedly "form the basis of the Personal Diary", simply does not correspond to reality. In order to be convinced that the chronology and subject matter of the entries in the diary are much broader than the discussions in Stalin's office, one need only read the diary.

To be honest, I was too lazy to count the exact number of daily entries in L.P.'s diary. Beria. The work of analyzing them and, even more so, of commenting on them (for which I had to draw on dozens, if not hundreds, of sources and thousands of documents) already exhausted me. But Professor Kozlov calculated something else and reports:

"... Beria visited Stalin's office at least 1485 times - almost every day, and sometimes during the day and several times. This eloquently indicates that Beria was indeed one of Stalin's closest associates, with whom they did quite real things. Beria's "Personal Diary" recorded only a part of such visits, the chronology of which is perfect and coincides with the entries in Stalin's Journals.

"Logic" here, as we see, "on top". If the chronology of Beria's diaries published by me turned out to be flawed, then Professor Kozlov would

31

would reveal them to be fake on that basis. However, as he himself testifies, the chronology is impeccable and coincides with the entries in Stalin's Journals. And on this basis, it is concluded again, about ... the falsification of the diaries.

We will encounter this "logic" in the future. Now I cannot fail to note the fact that, on the other hand, for Professor Kozlov, the execution of the Poles in Katyn by the "executioners of Beria" in 1940 is beyond doubt. "Exposing" me as a "falsifier", he exclaims:

"It is symbolic, however, that there is no entry in Beria's Personal Diary about the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks on March 5, 1940, at which a decision was made on extrajudicial reprisals against captured Polish officers. In Stalin's Journals, this meeting with the presence of

Beria is fixed. The absence of a record of this most important event in Beria's Personal Diary is understandable: its publisher casually calls all documents about this "fake". And then he even makes Beria in his diary indignant at Hitler's political and ideological "provocation". "It seems," Beria allegedly writes in his "Personal Diary" about the discovery of the corpses of executed Poles in Katyn, "these are the Poles who fled from us when we left Smolensk. They had to go to the rear on their own, and they remained with the Germans. Well, they got theirs. This public has always declared that it is better to be dead than red" (vol. 2, p. 111). For Kremlev, it is this entry by Beria that is "important confirmation of what, however, is now clear to any objective analyst: Polish prisoners of war were shot not by the NKVD in 1940 by decision of the Politburo, but by the Germans in 1941 in order to ensure yourself at a convenient moment a strong propaganda lever to complicate Soviet-Polish relations and discredit the Soviet Union in the outside world "

32

(Vol. 2, p. 111). An old song that makes no sense to comment after numerous documentaries

other publications on this issue".

I don't understand why the absence in Beria's personal diary of an entry about the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks dated March 5, 1940 is regarded by my reviewer as symbolic? Moreover, his phrase on this account contains one reliable statement and one unreliable one. The meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks on March 5, 1940 really took place. But why does this respected professor suddenly declare so confidently that at this meeting a decision was made on extrajudicial reprisals against captured Polish officers? Is this proven for sure?

Yes, the meeting of the Politburo on March 5 with the presence of Beria was recorded in Stalin's Journals. But the contents and agenda of this meeting are not disclosed in the "Journals .."! And the "Katyn" falsification itself has long been actually uncovered. But semi-official historians do not want to admit this point blank, despite all the indisputable evidence.

My opponent-reviewer accuses me of assessing the "Katyn" aspect of the issue casually... However, as a commentator on Beria's diaries, the analysis of the Katyn events did not and could not enter into my task, since in connection with the diaries this topic irrelevant, but casually talking about such things is really impossible. And I just noted in a footnote to the entry dated April 23, 1943, the fact of an obvious falsification of the "Katyn" case by anti-advisers.

33

But, firstly, the "Katyn" theme itself has long been studied by many casually.

Secondly, in connection with the theme of Beria, I by no means ignored this topic and wrote about this aspect of our not so much past as present life in my main book about Beria, "The Best Manager of the 20th Century."

Thirdly, a number of brilliant works by Yuri Mukhin are devoted to the analysis of the issue of Katyn, where it is clearly shown that the "Katyn crime of the NKVD" is a double (first Goebbels, and then Gorbachev-Yeltsin) fake. The monograph by V.N. Swede "The Secret of Katyn".

Yu.I. Mukhin, V.N. Shved and a number of other researchers noted, in particular, that the allegedly authentic "minutes of the PB meeting of March 5" and other "documents" were made on original forms, but withdrawn from circulation by March 1940, etc.

Finally, fourthly, and this is perhaps the most significant, shortly after the Putin-Medvedev "Katyn repentance", the late Viktor Ivanovich Ilyukhin, a deputy of the State Duma from the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, was given all materials using the "perestroika" manufacturing technology

"Katyn" fakes. The KIRF faction held a round table on the basis of these materials, etc.

This would be a place where Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov, a well-known debunker of falsifications and forgeries, a well-known Russian historian, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, could take part in establishing the truth. No, he exclaims at the convincing documentary revelations of the "Katyn" provocations: "An old song,

34

it makes no sense to comment on it after numerous documentary publications on this issue".

I would like to know what Professor Kozlov understands by "numerous documentary publications on this issue"? Isn't it a fake "minutes of the Politburo meeting of March 5, 1940", printed on a form removed from the document circulation since January 1, 1940?

I will pay more attention to the topic of Katyn in its place, but for now let's return to the review of my publication of the diaries of L.P. Beria.

Professor Kozlov writes:

"Stalin's journals made it possible for the falsifier to reflect in Beria's "Personal Diary" not only the actual chronology of Beria's visits to Stalin's office, but such details as the daily time of almost every visit. "Today, Comrade Stalin invited me early, I came, he is alone," recorded in the "Personal Diary" on March 31, 1939 (vol. 1, p. 110). Indeed, in Stalin's Journals for that day, the reception began at 4:40 pm with Beria, who stayed in Stalin's office until 8:15 pm (p. 255). An entry in the "Personal Diary" dated July 26, 1940 reports a visit to Stalin: "Just from him, we sat alone for two hours, then Shakhurin came ..." (vol. 1, p. 186). It corresponds to Stalin's Journals, which recorded the stay in Beria's office from 5:50 pm to 8:25 pm, and before Shakhurin's arrival at 7:10 pm, Beria actually talked alone with Stalin for 2 hours 5 minutes (p. 308).

That's right. The diary entry and the real story coincide, which is confirmed by Professor Kozlov himself. It would seem that this is another argument in favor of the authenticity of the diaries. No, my reviewer is not satisfied with the supposedly excessive detail in the days

nike - both in terms of chronology and the personal composition of those who visited Stalin (about the last moment - a little later).

At the same time, Professor Kozlov himself reports that L.P. Beria visited Stalin almost daily and often several times a day. So could this circumstance not find a natural reflection in the diary?

It must be said that my reviewer is very inaccurate when he claims that the entries in the diary are strictly connected with Stalin's Journals - this connection can be clearly seen only in wartime, which is quite understandable. After all, it was a very special period in the life of Stalin, and Beria, and Russia. Stalin then worked long hours every day, seven days a week. Beria, on the other hand, worked almost around the clock (his colleague in defense production and then in the Atomic Project, Boris Glebovich Muzrukov, and he was not alone, later recalled that during the war, Beria instantly answered the call at almost any time of the day).

Taking into account the military whirlwind, detailed notes in the diary about the time and circumstances of staying with Stalin had an undoubted and obvious practical value for Beria - only incorrigible academicians who have never in their lives been responsible for more or less a living thing.



Actually, Beria, like any outstanding organizer, had, of course, a well-developed habit of precision and concreteness. Therefore, it is not surprising that he recorded a number of details in his diary both before and after the war, but, I repeat, he entered such details especially often only during the war.

The same information function, among other things, was clearly performed by records of who visited Stalin and when. Although sometimes they have a clearly emotional connotation, about which - a little later.

Professor Kozlov writes:

"Stalin's journals served as the basis for the falsifier to reflect in the Personal Diary the composition of personal participants in Stalin's meetings and changes in them during one meeting. "Personal diary" is literally filled with entries like "then Koba detained me alone", "There were only Molotov, Zhdanov, Georgy (Malenkov. - V.K.)", "There was only Molotov", "Besides me there was only Molotov", "Today I was alone with Koba for almost an hour", "Today Comrade Stalin told me when we were left alone..." .K.) and Molotov", "Koba, Klim, Molotov and I were sitting ... Then the military approached", "Koba is sitting with the marshals and generals, He has not summoned me yet", "Koba is constantly conferring with the military", "I sat for an hour with Koba and Sholokhov... Then we were left alone", "Koba held a meeting on oil. I gathered everyone, there were almost 50 people", "The day before yesterday Koba had a big meeting with the military. We were not invited, only Vyacheslav was there (Molotov — V.K.). Today I visited Koba together with Vsevolod (Merkulov. - V.K.)", "Just from Koba. There were only Vyacheslav, George Ia" (vol. 1, pp. 67, 71, 78, 79, 84, 96, 167, 169, 174, 183, 186-187, 191, 206, 253, 308). Examples of such entries could be continued indefinitely, and all of them exclusively go back to Stalin's Journals (cf. pp. 242, 245, 246, 295, 298, 306, 308, 309, 313, 321, 334, 335, 355, respectively) ".

I can state with full responsibility that the diary of L.P. Beria is not filled with entries of the "type" ... and that examples of such entries cannot be continued "indefinitely".

37

To understand whether I have the right to such a statement, it is enough to read the diary with a pencil in hand. My reviewer simply compressed a number of separate sentences from different entries into one block and created the impression that the diary almost consists of just such short fixations. But, firstly, this is not so (I will show this a little lower), and secondly, we are dealing with diary entries for a decade and a half!

From such an array of records, if you wish, you can, sorry, kick anything! Or does the historian Kozlov not know that the citation must be correct?

As for Professor Kozlov's statement that all the entries in the diary he quoted "exclusively go back to Stalin's Journals", then it turns out in general in the elderberry garden, and in Kiev the uncle. How can the entries in the diary about the stay in Stalin's office (even if we assume that the diary is falsified) differ from the entries in the journals published today, where these visits were recorded?

In any case - even a skillful falsification, even genuine records - full compliance should be evident. But that's the way it is. And in my opinion, the full correlation of the chronology and factual records in the diary and precisely established historical collisions prove just the opposite - the authenticity of the diaries of L.P. Beria.

Professor Kozlov asks the question: "Why did the forger need to systematically report such details throughout Beria's "Personal Diary?" - and responds to him like this:

"The thing is that the chronicle of visits, the time of visits, the composition of the visitors, which often changed in the course of meetings with Stalin, are the only real and reliable facts impartially recorded in Stalin's Journals. The references to them in Beria's "Personal Diary" were supposed, according to the forger's intention, to give the published documentary source signs of not only authenticity, but also reliability. The falsifier's desire to emphasize the authenticity and reliability of Beria's "Personal Diary" with these details involuntarily turned Beria into a man maniacally striving to record not only his presence at Stalin's meeting, but also the presence of his other comrades, and even note the sequence of their arrivals and departures within the same meeting. The "outstanding manager", it turns out, did not shy away from primitive personal fillerism.

Well, firstly, there are simply no such details throughout the entire diary. This I, as a publisher of diaries, can also state with all responsibility, and this is proved by a simple attentive reading of the diary, still with a pencil in hand.

I must say that I am grateful to Professor Kozlov - he forced me to return once again to the text of the diaries in the light of his accusations and to once again test my conclusion about the authenticity of the text. And the results of my additional analysis only strengthened my confidence.

And if we talk about the signs of the authenticity and reliability of the diaries, then the most convincing should be recognized, in my opinion, not information about the presence of one or another of Beria's colleagues in Stalin's office, but reliable historical data present in the text of the diaries. . Professor Kozlov himself (more on that later) does not deny full compliance  
all dos

true historical events, etc. the one described in the diary.

But what about the accusation that, by allegedly falsifying diaries, I turned Beria into a kind of hybrid of a narcissist and a sleuth? According to my opponent, Beria in his diaries turns out to be contradictory ambiguous: on the one hand, he allegedly strives maniacally to emphasize, even in private, his constant closeness to Stalin, and on the other hand, like an orderly at the bedside table, he petty notes sequence of comings and goings within one meeting of their colleagues...

Professor Kozlov ironically says that the "outstanding manager" did not shun, it turns out, primitive personal flirting.

By the way...

The phrase "...The outstanding manager", it turns out, did not disdain primitive personal flirting" in the version published in the academic journal Voprosy istorii does not exist. Obviously, it was considered too vulgar for publication of this level. But it is symbolic that the words "outstanding manager" are quoted by Professor Kozlov – they say, what an "outstanding" one! On the other hand, the words about primitive personal filership are not provided with quotation marks, clearly betraying the complete rejection by the modern Russian historian of the historical role of L.P. Beria.

I will elaborate on this point later.

So how - was Lavrenty Pavlovich inclined to spy on his colleagues even in Stalin's Kremlin office or the fact that in his notes the presence of  
count

40

lay down and their comings and goings can be explained in a different way than Professor Kozlov did?

My opponent explains this feature of the diaries by the desire of the falsifier Kremlyov to give the allegedly forged diaries more credibility. But a careful study of diary entries from the positions defended by Professor Kozlov (I repeat that I undertook such an analysis only after reading his article) shows, firstly, that the detailing of arrivals and departures, etc. characteristic mainly of the period of the war.

I have already noted that this was a special period. And does the one who undertakes to analyze the text of the diaries of L.P. Beria (or anyone else) in order to establish their authenticity, to lose sight of and not take into account a purely psychological moment?

Let's put ourselves in Beria's place.

War... The situation sometimes changes kaleidoscopically within one day. But for Beria, day after day proceeds, in some respects, extremely monotonously: People's Commissariat, Council of People's Commissars, Stalin's office, Council of People's Commissars, meetings, a quick snack, Stalin's office, a short sleep, a quick breakfast, People's Commissariat, etc.

So - day after day ... Somewhere they retreat and advance, someone dies or fights, and Beria is busy day after day with the same thing: he listens, speaks, reads, writes, somehow sleeps, somehow eats, reads, dictates, writes, speaks, listens, speaks...

And then he listens again, speaks, reads and writes.

Day after day, the same faces and situations.

41

From some point on, these faces will stand in front of you all the time - just close your eyes. Every mushroom picker knows that after a successful but tiring day in the forest, falling asleep, you see mushrooms, mushrooms, mushrooms before your eyes ...

This is how - as far as I can imagine - it was for Beria when he was left alone with himself and his diary. Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov, Merkulov, Mikoyan, etc. were still standing before my eyes. Beria again, writing down the impressions and thoughts of the day, experienced the events of the day, and this was reflected in the style of wartime records. Moreover, the old Chekist Beria's habit of precision could not help manifesting itself in both big and small things, almost reflexively.

No, Professor Kozlov sees here either the clumsiness of the "falsifier" of the Kremlin, or the "primitive personal filery" of Beria.

But if we analyze each specific "suspicious" (from the point of view of Professor Kozlov) entry in the diaries, we can see that the mention of the appearance of a particular person in Stalin's office or his departure has a different coloring in different entries and does not is a simple registration in the manner of how it was done in Stalin's Journals. Often, in the context of a recording, such a mention carries a well-defined semantic or emotional load.

And it can be shown.

Let us take, for the purity of the experiment, the last two entries given by Professor Kozlov himself (it was possible to take the first two or any two others, the essence of the analysis will not change).

So, his first alleged quote: "The day before yesterday, Koba held a big meeting with the military. We are not at

42

said, there was only Vyacheslav (Molotov. - V.K.). Today I visited Koba together with Vsevolod (Merkulov — V.K.)."

Three phrases shamelessly torn out of the text are taken from the first volume of the diaries "Stalin Does Not Believe in Tears" (p. 253). A reader who is not familiar with the diaries may think that this supposedly "filing" entry was all that was limited. But this is absolutely not the case. Here is what we actually find in the diary dated May 26, 1941:

"The day before yesterday, Koba had a big meeting with the military. We were not invited, only Vyacheslav was (V.M. Molotov. - S.K.).

Today Koba was with Vsevolod [1]. Vsevolod raised the question of the arrest of Sergeev [2] and Vannikov [3] before Koba. We'll have to arrest and start an investigation. There is data, especially on Sergeev. Georgy (G.M. Malenkov. - S.K.) supports.

I don't understand how people fall apart. Sergeyev is the son of a worker. You were raised, taught, work. And you become a bastard. This is a serious matter, it will have to wind and wind. A

But Vannikov is sorry, he blabbed.

Then we talked about the general situation. Koba is nervous. It doesn't look like him, but he has nothing to hide in front of us. He told me and Vsevolod that only your subordinates know more than you [4]. He looked at Ponomarenko and said: "But Panteleimon already has everything in sight" (in the notes to the texts of "Diaries" 1, 2, Zi 4, I gave the relevant information. - S.K.).

Well, where are the signs and traces of "filing" here? The fact of Molotov's presence at the meeting and the fact of coming to Stalin with Merkulov are not emphasized. They are simply mentioned - out of Beria's habit of accuracy, that's all. Professor Kozlov line up

43

around an incorrectly cited not even a fragment, but a fragment of a record, a whole theory.

Is it worth it?

At the same time, I draw the reader's attention to the fact that from 23.25, along with Beria and the People's Commissar for State Security Vsevolod Merkulov, Malenkov and the 1st Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Belarus Ponomarenko were also in Stalin's office. Malenkov was summoned to see Stalin at 9:15 p.m., along with Shakhurin, Yakovlev, and Voronin, the leaders of the people's commissariat for the aviation industry, who left just at 11:25 p.m. However, as we can see, Beria did not note their arrival and departure and their presence in Stalin's office in his diary. After all, the main thing in the entry dated 05/26/41 is what concerns the circumstances relating to the "eparchy" of Merkulov.

Merkulov, by the way, went into the office with Beria, but left less than half an hour later - at 23.50, on his own. Either the "forger" Kremlin, or the "filer" Beria blundered and did not note this fact. As Beria did not note that the three of them left Stalin - he, Malenkov and Ponomarenko, already at 15 minutes past midnight.

However, this is quite understandable: after all, Lavrenty Pavlovich was a major statesman, and not a secretary-registrar.

And here is another "quote" from the diaries, quoted by Professor Kozlov: "Just from Koby. There were only Vyacheslav, Georgy and me."

Alas, my opponent here incorrectly pulled out of context only one phrase. But in reality we are dealing with a very extensive record (vol. 1, pp. 307-308).

And record for what number!

For November 7, 1941!

44

The day of the 24th anniversary of the October Revolution passed, a parade of troops of the Moscow garni zone on Red Square took place, the day before, on November 6, the traditional solemn meeting of the Moscow City Council took place, this time at the Mayakovskaya metro station, spoke at this meeting of the

And on the night of November 7-8, Stalin from 0.10 to 0.40 gathered in his office, only Molotov, Malenkov and Beria. What could they talk about and why could Stalin gather them on such a night, after so many events? The diary entry gives us the answer to this question through decades.

Here is the entry in full:

"Here you x ... d, ane Moscow. The parade was held and will be held in a year! And in ten! And after a hundred! And we will hold a parade in Berlin!

How the mud was washed away. Koba is Genius! Another would think it's not time. Aon said, it is necessary to carry out. And they did!

And the meeting was held.

Just from Koba. There were only Vyacheslav, George and me. He said, well, comrades, we did not think a year ago that we would celebrate the October anniversary in this way. But the main thing is that we celebrated it and will continue to celebrate it. And this scoundrel Hitler, perhaps, will celebrate the tenth anniversary of his Reihai, but he will not be able to see the fifteenth anniversary! Then he looked at us and said, which fifteenth? What are we, for a year we can not manage?

Maybe we'll make it. Three for sure!"

Isn't Professor Kozlov really capable of admitting that Beria, not for "filer" reasons, noted in his personal diary the fact that Stalin invited only the closest and most important associates to his office on such a day!

Actually, it's already night...

45

Oh yes, however, it was not Beria who wrote it down. It was the forger and liar Kremlyov who made him look like a "primitive spy".

Having analyzed the text of the diary in a similar "deep" way, Professor Kozlov sums up:

"Thus, it is obvious that one of the sources of falsification of Beria's "Personal Diary" was Stalin's Journals, and the forger not only failed to hide their use, but and unwittingly betrayed his dependence on them.

I repeat: Professor Kozlov is breaking through the open door. Not only did I not try to hide the use of Stalin's Journals in my work (not to falsify, but to analyze the text of the diaries and the events described in it), but I spoke about it directly and more than once.

The "Journals" were really a kind of "guiding star" for me, although when preparing the diaries for publication, I used, if we continue the comparison, the entire "star map" of the era, that is, a lot of both documentary sources and memoirs, etc. And we must give him his due, Professor Kozlov "sharply" saw this feature of my work as well, noting:

"However, in the hands of the forger were not only the published Journals of Stalin. By the time the forgery was prepared, he had at his disposal numerous documentary publications of authentic documentary sources, which he used in the preparation of Beria's Personal Diary. And we must pay tribute to the forger for his zeal: they are innumerable. Therefore, pitying ourselves and our readers, we will confine ourselves to just a few examples.

46

What are these examples? But what are:

"The entry dated December 24, 1941 in Beria's Personal Diary reports: "I'm sorting out the old blockages. In October, materials were received from London on work in the field of atomic energy... Allegedly, serious work is already underway. It is reported that the force of the explosion will be enormously greater than that of conventional explosives... I won't report anything to Kobe until I figure it out. Maybe a lie? Let's see" (vol. 2, p. 314). This entry is nothing more than a falsified interpretation of the original set of documents published in the documentary publication "Atomic Project of the USSR" (vol. 1, part 1, pp. 239-245). The same publication (vol. 11, v. 2, pp. 440-444) became, for example, the source of part of the entry in the "Personal Diary" dated February 28, 1946: "I have been studying Uranus for a year, infusion ... whether squabbles with scientists. Meshik reports: there were complications with Academician Semyonov. They cannot agree on which one to use..." (vol. 3, p. 15). The entry dated April 17, 1946 on the meeting of the Special Committee of the Council of Ministers of the USSR on the atomic bomb (book 3, pp. 21-22) is a retelling of the corresponding protocol of the meeting of the Special Committee dated April 13, 1949 (vol. 11, book 1, pp. 90 - 91)".

There is nothing to argue with here! When analyzing and preparing the diaries for publication (including commenting on the entries), I really made the most careful use of precisely that multi-volume edition of documents on the USSR Atomic Project, which Professor Kozlov mentions.

But could it be otherwise? Just like Stalin's Journals, this capital "atomic" documentary source simply cannot be ignored and used both for evaluating the authenticity of the diaries and for commenting on them.

I used it all the more actively, which is good

47

I am familiar with those who did a great job of declassifying and publishing the documents of the Soviet Atomic Project - Hero of Socialist Labor, physicist G.A. Goncharov (now, unfortunately, deceased) and a former employee of the 12th Main Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Defense, Colonel P.P. Maksimenko.

Let's continue our acquaintance with Professor Kozlov's "revelations":

"The entry dated October 13, 1941 in Beria's "Personal Diary" reports a certain "big conversation" with Stalin: "He proved Kobe again," Beria allegedly writes, "that to blow up the city (Moscow. - V.K.) and leave not a matter. We won't really blow it up, because we already have experience, when we retreat, it's a mess... But we need to organize our defense more strongly in case of street fights..." (vol. 1, p. 306). Here, the forger had at his disposal another source - a multi-volume documentary publication "State Security Organs of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War", which contains the "Resolution of the State Defense Committee on the holding of special events for enterprises in Moscow and the Moscow region" dated October 8, 1941 (vol. 2, book 2, pp. 185 - 186) and "Note of the commission on special events to the State Defense Committee with a list of enterprises in the city of Moscow and the Moscow region scheduled for destruction niyu" dated October 9, 1941 (vol. 2, book 2, pp. 196 - 197). The same publication (vol. 111, book 1, p. 27), for example, formed the basis of Beria's "Personal Diary" entry dated January 7, 1942: "Hands reach what they reach, what they don't reach. Well reminded Rogov.

Gotta fix it. The fleet looks at the special officers even worse than the army. Gouging. Naval reconnaissance works x ... in, the boats died, don't understand why, but they are all naval traditions. Fuck your traditions. The best people were given to you ... Well, all right, we will quickly strengthen and improve this business "(vol. 2, p. 12).

The use of the documents of these two documentary publications in the falsification of Beria's "Personal Diary" can be traced quite often.

48

And here I have to upset my opponent ...

Alas, I did not and do not have at my disposal the multi-volume documentary edition "State Security Organs of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War" - after all, I, not a Muscovite and not an official researcher, have the capabilities of Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences V.P. Kozlova No.

So, to my greatest regret, I did not even hold in my hands those volumes that Professor Kozlov refers to as an alleged source of falsification. (This refers to the volumes "State Security Organs of the USSR in the Great Patriotic War: Collection of Documents. Vol. 2. Book 2: Beginning: September 1 - December 31, 1941. - M., 2000; The same. - T. 3. Book 1: The collapse of the "blitzkrieg": January 1 - June 30, 1942. - M., 2003).

Already after the publication of three volumes of diaries, I accidentally acquired, while visiting Tver, only one volume of this major publication, but it dates back to the time the Wehrmacht was preparing the "Citadel" operation in the Kursk Bulge region, that is, to the spring of 1943. The presence of this volume at hand allowed me to expand the commentary on the 4th volume of the already undated materials of L.P. Beria "There will be no Russia without Stalin".

So Professor Kozlov can include only this volume in the list of documents "used by the Kremlin for falsification".

I can also suggest to him that I had to carefully and thoughtfully work with those volumes of collections of documents "Lubyanka and Stalin", which cover the period from 1937 to 1953.

As for the other documentary publications of authentic documentary sources, which I, according to Professor Kozlov, "is

49

used in the preparation of Beria's "Personal Diary" and which, according to his calculations, "are innumerable", I confess that here my opponent got, as they say, to the point.

During the time of preparing the diaries for publication, commenting on them and providing detailed notes, I rummaged through and used, if not mountains, then certainly a couple of hills of collections of documents, newspaper and magazine publications, memoirs, "memoirs" and biographical reference books.

After all, I understood my task (and my duty both to "Pavel Lavrentievich" and to Lavrenty Pavlovich) not simply as the publication of the sensational diaries of an outstanding historical figure, but precisely as an assessment and analysis of that era, the witness and creator of which was L.P. Beria.

Professor Kozlov also did not pass by this aspect of the diaries, but how!

That's how:

"The three sources of falsification mentioned above and many others made it possible for the falsifier, under the guise of genuine documentary sources, to falsify

and "diary entries" of Beria, which already characterize him as a person, a personality, a statesman. Before us appears not so much a convinced communist as a pragmatic statesman, for whom, however, there are no fortresses that he cannot conquer, thanks to his indomitable energy, brilliant organizational skills, ability to select and mobilize people".

Here it turns out in general in the elderberry garden, and in Kyiv the uncle! Since when, first of all, convinced com

50

is the communist commanded to be a pragmatic statesman, and the pragmatic statesman to be a committed communist?

Secondly, a true communist leader is always a pragmatic statesman. figure. Here Khrushchev, for example, was a caricature of a real communist, and therefore he never been a pragmatic statesman, but he proved himself an outstanding voluntarist and an outstanding mediocrity.

And, thirdly, what was L.P. to do? Beria, keeping a diary, so that Professor Kozlov would deign to recognize him as a convinced communist? Through the word to write: "Long live the all-conquering Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist doctrine!" or "Hurray for the CPSU (b) and its glorious successor to the CPSU!"?

Today it is no longer possible to totally discredit L.P. Beria "on the forehead", attesting him as a primitive executioner, able to "lead" only with a whip. In any case, such an approach to Beria already impossible for any professional historian, since such an approach is uniquely discredits as a non-professional, first of all, the detractor himself.

Today, even the most engaged historians, at least through gritted teeth, admit the national scale of Beria and his undoubted talent as an organizer. However, at the same time, as we see that attempts to tear Beria away from the ideas of socialism and from the conscious, activity determined by inner conviction for the benefit of precisely socialism as working society and for working people.

These attempts to depoliticize Beria to the extent possible are quite understandable. One thing - an example of a kind of Soviet Ford, and another thing -

51

a brilliant example of an ideological Bolshevik who knows how to organize not just subordinates, but comrades in a common cause, to phenomenally successful social construction.

So Professor Kozlov wants to see (even if not in a genuine document, but in, as he claims, a falsified source) Beria "not so much a convinced communist, but pragmatic statesman.

Here my opponent-reviewer once again fails logic. Looking ahead, I will say that Professor Kozlov calls the motivation for me the desire to rehabilitate "they have become nism in general."

But if so, then I should have just the opposite, to introduce as many falsifications as possible into the text such passages that would emphasize the ideological nature, Bolshevism of Beria.

But - here, it turns out that the image of a convinced communist Beria does not add up when getting acquainted with Beria's diaries.

At least for my reviewer.

Y



HAY yes "Stalinist" Kremlev! Well, miss! It needs to be so messed up! He wanted to make Beria an ideological ally of Stalin, but he only made a "pragmatic statesman" - either the Soviet Roosevelt, or Deng Xiaoping, or Ludwig Erhard ...

But the point is that Professor Kozlov seems to have a poor idea of what it is to be a staunch communist in the era of real socialist and communist construction. It seems, I repeat, that Professor Kozlov cannot imagine such a communist without statements, through phrases like: "I hate the damned bourgeois!"

the great Stalin is here!", "The death of capitalism is as inevitable as the coming of autumn after spring" etc. go.

However, in reality, a convinced communist in the era of Stalin is, first of all, a person who is aware of the exceptional social creative possibilities inherent only in socialism, that is, a society without capitalists. A convinced communist is a person who is personally more interested in living and working in a society where everyone should work for society just as society should work for him.

And just such a convinced communist Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria, of course, was. He did not work for the sake of accumulating personal wealth and the possibility of entertainment all over the world - from Courchevel to space tourism, but simply because he was interested in creating something new and great, and for a bright developed personality, genuine socialism provides in this regard almost limitless possibilities

Moreover, genuine, and not mutilated by Khrushchevism, Brezhnevism and Gorbachevism and under dug "moles" socialism is organized in such a way that a bright person gets the opportunity to achieve not only individual success, but also success ensured by the efforts of the collective, led by a bright personality.

In this regard, the Soviet Union of the Stalin era was a gigantic collective, unprecedented in world history, led by a cohort of bright personalities, the most bright and talented of which were Stalin and Beria.

Professor Kozlov does not seem to realize that a big personality can enthusiastically and do a lot of work.

donate to society not for positions, not for shares and dividends, not for the opportunity to buy a fashionable etiquette or a football club ...

A talented person, a major socialist organizer and politician is able to work hard simply because it is damn exciting and interesting, even if you don't see the white light behind your deeds and shorten your life for years.

And besides, there is also a sense of duty, responsibility - both to the Motherland and to one's own talent.

Stalin and those of his comrades-in-arms who did not betray him understood all this well and lived by this.

And just such a communist Beria is clearly visible from the text of the diaries, as well as from his undated materials published by me already in 2012.

But the credit for this belongs, of course, not to the "falsifier" Kremlin, but to Beria himself and the era that shaped him, exalted and revealed him.

Professor Kozlov writes about Beria, who was allegedly falsified by the Kremlin, as follows:

"He is above all members of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, with the exception of Stalin, whom he bows to, seeing his weaknesses (for example, suspiciousness), he respects Molotov and a little Malenkov, despises Khrushchev, etc. In other words, we have a worthy successor to Stalin, real

deeds and strategic thinking proved his right to do so. A kind of dynamo machine, ready after the death of Stalin to spin the USSR into a prosperous future."

In such an assessment of Beria, there is much that is incorrect, almost slanderous ...

54

Beria did not bow before Stalin as before an icon, but, being himself a major personality, he clearly saw the scale of Stalin.

Beria treated his colleagues quite adequately, but his business superiority became more and more obvious over the years, including for himself. Sergei Yesenin publicly declared at the age of thirty: "I know a lot about my talent"... So, Beria did not have the right to say the same about himself, for example, at 50 years old - in 1949?

At the same time, Beria did not envy anyone, but many envied him, and they did not envy his status, but precisely his talent.

Beria did not despise Khrushchev, he simply was not mistaken about his business qualities, although, as it turned out, in the most tragic way for himself, he was mistaken about his moral qualities.

But with the definition of Beria as "a dynamo machine, ready after the death of Stalin to spin the USSR into a prosperous future," I can only congratulate Professor Kozlov. This is indeed well said. And if I really were the true author of Beria's diaries, I would congratulate myself on the fact that even Professor Kozlov managed to form just such an impression of Beria.

And so I just feel satisfaction from the fact that the scale of that era sometimes inspires even the figures of this "epoch" to such accurate metaphors.

I will later return to the topic of the era and its reflection in the works of modern historians and "historians", but for now, remaining within the framework of the answer directly to my reviewer, I will proceed to an analysis of the conclusions of Professor Kozlov's article.

However, before that, a couple of introductory words ...

As I have noted more than once, before taking up the work of preparing materials for L.P. Beria for publication in earnest, I carried out some preliminary analysis of the text of the diaries, including its informational structure. Professor Kozlov added to the analysis, and for this, but only for this, I am sincerely grateful to him.

Professor Kozlov clearly singled out three main structural information layers in the text, supposedly fundamentally different from each other, and gave them an assessment. But what!

He's writing:

"Thus, Beria's "Personal Diary" is a compilation of three layers of information: 1) documentary evidence of genuine and reliable documentary historical sources; 2) documentary evidence, which is an attempt by a falsifier to reconstruct some events that are indistinctly, if not not reflected at all in authentic and reliable documentary historical sources, i.e. create some kind of hypothetical model of what really happened in the past, which the forger gives credibility by wrapping it in the entries of Beria's "diary" and 3) completely falsified records relating to allegedly Beria's assessments of what is happening, his intentions, actions, traits of character " .

Having accepted the structure of Professor Kozlov's conclusions, we can say, firstly, the following:

1. My opponent does not refute, at least in large part, the fact that the image of Beria as a "dynamo machine, ready after Stalin's death to spin the USSR into a prosperous future", which follows from the text of the diaries, is confirmed

56

"a whole layer" of documentary evidence of authentic and reliable documentary historical sources.

And this is already progress in comparison with the image of Beria as an "executioner" and "provocateur".

2. My opponent does not refute, at least in large part, the fact that the positive image of Beria, arising from his diaries, is also indirectly confirmed by those data that, although not always clearly, are also reflected in authentic and reliable documentary sources.

And that's good too.

3. Finally, let's evaluate the last "layer" of information, which my opponent defines as "completely falsified records concerning supposedly Beria's assessments of what is happening, his intentions, actions, character traits."

But after all, in order to have grounds to define this or that information as a falsification, it would be necessary to provide convincing evidence for this, right? Those honest people who know that the Poles in Katyn were shot by the Germans in 1941 give a lot of evidence of this. The facts also confirm that the alleged Katyn documents from a certain "Special Folder of the Central Committee of the CPSU" are fake. The falsifiers of both history and documents simply assure us that they are right. Using the dictionary of Professor Kozlov, they suggest that we believe in the authenticity of the execution of Poles by "executioners from the NKVD" in 1940.

This is exactly what Professor Kozlov does when he questions the authenticity of Beria's diaries. He claims that they are false, but he does not provide a single factual evidence to support his assessment. All his reasoning

57

are speculative in nature and are based on logical and psychological "arguments" of very dubious persuasiveness.

What can be regarded as reliable and convincing evidence of a particular lie or fiction? Of course, only a comparison of lies or fiction with genuine and reliable historical facts.

For example, in an alleged letter addressed to Khrushchev regarding the involvement of the NKVD in the execution in Katyn, the then chairman of the KGB of the USSR Shelepin allegedly refers to the Decree of the Central Committee of the CPSU of March 5, 1940, although in 1940 the VKP(b) acted in the USSR.

This circumstance alone allows us to assume falsification here.

And also, if in Beria's diary entry for, for example, 1944, this or that front commander in the rank of, for example, commander of the 1st rank, would appear, this would also immediately prove the falsification of the diaries.

If in the diaries, for example, for 1942, there was an entry relating to some meeting at the Lubyanka, while Beria was in the Caucasus, organizing its defense, then this could also be regarded as a forgery - at least re part of the information that is contained in a specific unreliable record.

I emphasize: even in this case, it is possible to correctly declare a forgery only in a specific unreliable entry, and not in the entire diary. After all, this unreliable entry could be introduced into the text, which is generally authentic, by Khrushchev's falsifiers who gained access to the diaries of L.P. Beria, and "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his comrades could not notice the forgery.

This is all to the point that if someone undertakes to check Beria's diaries for authenticity, then it must be carried out with all scientific thoroughness, with an analysis of all possible options, including the possibility of partial forgery.

It is easy to say, taking advantage of academic opportunities and closeness to the current anti-communist authorities, that the Kremlin simply invented the diaries. But this, after all, must be convincingly proved by facts, and not by idle statements like "Beria could not write like that, because he could not write never.

By the way, if we approach the problem with academic thoroughness, then textological, lexical, and style analysis - at least superficially, but must be carried out! By publishing the diaries, I openly called for this to my potential opponents even before comments appeared on the Internet forums, which claimed that the diaries were "fake".

If one of the "analysts" found words and expressions like "humanitarian aid", "manager", "marketing", "political correctness", etc. in the diaries, then there would be grounds for such statements.

If there were entries in the diaries like: "Yesterday I returned from Courchevel, went skiing" or: "My new yacht cost me ten million dollars. Mikoyan bought the same one for three million more", then this would also be evidence of forgery.

However, neither my "network" critics, nor the academic professor Kozlov report anything that does not agree with historical facts. But Professor Kozlov himself admits:

"The first layer of information, in part primarily related to the chronology of the entries in Beria's "Personal Diary," is one hundred percent consistent with what really happened."

I already wrote above that the "logic" here is "on top". If the chronology and factology in diary entries did not coincide with historical reality, then all semi-official historians would not fail to point out every inaccuracy and issue a verdict: "Forgery."

They do not find a single discrepancy with the facts, about which they themselves speak. The verdict, however, is the same: "Forgery."

In short, recalling Ivan Andreevich Krylov, one can say that I am to blame for the fact that they want to eat.

If it is reported about Beria by academicians of the Khrushchev era or television men of the Yeltsinoid era that Beria destroyed the flower of the Red Army, headed by Tukhachevsky, then this must be taken on faith.

If someone, like Sergei Kremlev, objects that in 1937 the NKVD was led by Yezhov, that Beria had nothing to do with the liquidation of the Tukhachevsky conspiracy, heading Soviet Georgia, then this is "falsification and forgery."

So Professor Kozlov conducts his speeches, referring to the diaries of L.P. Beria, like this:

"The second layer - reconstruction - can be taken into account, especially in obvious cases, as some evidence of creative attempts (well, well! - S.K.) of a falsifier to restore this or that fact, event, phenomenon of the past on the basis of authentic, in most of the published documents. If this layer were presented in the form of an article, mono-

60

graphs, it could become a historiographical fact. Clothed in a "diary" form, it has absolutely no scientific significance.

What is said here - translated from the academic language into Russian?

And here's what...

The respected professor involuntarily admits that Kremlev (i.e., according to Professor Kozlov, a "falsifier") managed to reconstruct certain events, albeit not fully reflected (or not reflected at all) in authentic and reliable documentary historical sources, in such a way that these the events he reproduced quite adequately reflect the course of real, documented history.

These events either could have been, or actually were!

That is, according to Professor Kozlov, I created "a kind of hypothetical model" of events that really could have happened in the past or even actually happened, but were not reflected in the documents.

Well, thanks for that.

Of course, I did not create any "hypothetical model" of events - undocumented events of ancient years and certain circumstances associated with them were recorded and described by the author of the diaries, that is, L.P. Beria. But it's good that Professor Kozlov favorably did not refuse the "second information layer" the right to correspond to real history.

Moreover! Professor Kozlov admits:

"If this layer were presented in the form of an article, a monograph, it could become a historiographic

skim fact. Clothed in a "diary" form, it has absolutely no scientific values."

61

And here's something I don't understand...

It turns out that if Kremlev had not been "struggling" in "creative efforts" to "invent" "Beria's diaries" (I use the dictionary of my critics), but simply analyzed a number of moments in history, drawing not so much on documentary sources (which, in fact, , in this case not), but by conducting a logical analysis and openly building some "hypothetical models" of events that could really happen in the past, then this, according to Professor Kozlov, would be acceptable and acceptable.

And if Kremlev had presented his conclusions in the form of an article or monograph, then such a result of Kremlev's "creative efforts" could be favorably recognized by Professor Kozlov and his academic colleagues even as a "historiographic fact."

And the same result of the same work, but, "dressed in a "diary" form", does not, it turns out, according to Professor Kozlov, "exactly no scientific significance".

So what, you ask, is more important for you, gentlemen, comrades, the form or the content?

Maybe content is more important?

I hope the reader is aware that my above reasoning, which contains the assumption of a text "invented" by me, I cited to illustrate the allegedly twisted "logic" of my opponent. In reality, of course, I did not invent anything.

Further...

If you, gentlemen historians, admit that the content - albeit, according to your assurances, not genuine, but false (even so, although this is not so!) - Beria's diaries in a huge number of

tea not only does not contradict the true history of the era, but fully corresponds to them, then you are carving yourself.

Historians-academicians calmly look at how at different social levels - from the highest state to "cable-gobbel" television - the true history is distorted and mutilated beyond recognition. And such a total falsification in the spirit of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism does not disturb or outrage historians from the Academy of Sciences.

Quite often, historians themselves are engaged in the same, that is, a conscious and obvious falsification for informed people, such as that Stalin allegedly met the war drunk, and Beria allegedly "erased into camp dust" on June 21, 1941. secret agents" who allegedly warned Stalin that the war would start tomorrow.

Even though Stalin began his day on June 22, 1941 at 5.45 a.m. and worked for days on end from that day ...

It's for nothing that Beria not only didn't "wipe out" any, moreover, never existed agents, but over and over again in real time informed Stalin about military preparations on the other side of the border.

No, recklessly, excitedly, lying and lying about that era, now and then consecrating lies or overexposure with academic regalia - this is acceptable.

And if some, albeit not reliably authentic, document recreates the true history of the era (which academicians, as we see, admit through gritted teeth), then this is a forgery.

Forgery of the era for them, it turns out, is acceptable.

A text that adequately recreates the era, it turns out, is unacceptable? It is immediately declared a forgery, and

Kremlev, I repeat, turns out to be to blame for the fact that the gentlemen-academicians want to eat more, and preferably the "green" "cabbage" of Western grants...

N-yeah...

Yes, I was not provided with formally reliable evidence of the authenticity of L.P.'s materials. Beria. But do Professor Kozlov and other academicians have the right to unsubstantiatedly declare these materials to be forgeries?

Precisely unsubstantiated, because neither Professor Kozlov nor any of my other opponents provided convincing proof of the forgery!

Let us take the common law... Its basis — and precisely the basis of the classical bourgeois law so beloved by so many now — is the principle of the presumption of innocence.

I remind you that a presumption is an assumption that is considered reliable until proven otherwise by law. According to this principle, every person is considered innocent until proven guilty in the manner prescribed by law.

Until proven otherwise, lawyers consider the fact to be reliable.

The situation with Beria's diaries does not exist in the field of jurisprudence, but in the field of history and historical analysis, and the procedure for its consideration is established not by legislation, but by the norms of scientific analysis.

But are these norms kept by Professor Kozlov?

After all, a lie is a lie. And what kind of lies - in the broad historical sense - can we talk about if - in the broad historical sense - the public

64

calation materials L.P. Beria restored historical truth?

Moving from general reasoning to the text of the diaries of L.P. Beria, I note that even Professor Kozlov cannot point out a single false fact in the text of the diaries, except for the "fact" asserted by the professor that this, in principle, historically adequate text allegedly does not belong to Beria's pen.

In fact, the "expertise" of Professor Kozlov revealed only that at least the main part of the text of the diaries of L.P. Beria is either completely historically reliable, or does not contradict the objective historical picture of the era described in the diaries.

But Professor Kozlov singles out the third information layer in the text of the diaries and writes the following about it:

"Moreover, the third, relatively speaking, "personal" layer of information about Beria, coming from Beria, does not have such a meaning - here we see not conjecture, often born by enthusiasm for the idea, but exclusively conscious falsification."

Of course you can say whatever...

Yes, and write - too, paper will endure everything.

But it does not hurt to remember: what is written with a pen cannot be cut down with an ax.

And what did Professor Kozlov write here?

He wrote that part of the text of the diaries (let us note that not the entire text, but only one of its "layers") is "an exclusively conscious falsification".

After such a responsible statement, one can

it was expected that my opponent would immediately give at least one concrete confirmation of such a statement.

Alas!

Not a single example is given!

Yes, if the diaries are not authentic and are forgeries, then they must necessarily contain that third layer that Professor Kozlov is talking about. Actually, then the whole "diary" it consists of only one such layer.

But after all, it is not enough just to assume the presence of this layer - its presence must be proved! Is not it? Moreover, it is necessary to prove irrefutably, citing direct evidence, and not idle reasoning.

niya...

Well, let's say, if the following entry were found in the text: "December 20, 1940 Yesterday I finished the poem "Great Stalin in the Caucasus" and read it at a meeting of the Politburo in the presence of

Koby. Approved, and we will publish under the pseudonym "Alexander Yesenin", then where should such a record be taken?

To the third, according to Professor Kozlov's classification, layer of information?

But this is not a fact!

Yes, such information is not confirmed by reliable documents either directly or indirectly. But it is not refuted by reliable documents! Even such a record - by itself - Professor Kozlov could only certify as doubtful in terms of reliability, and not as false.

Yes! Even if there were such an entry in the text of the diaries, then even in this case Professor Kozlov or anyone else would not have a convincing

There are no other grounds for evaluating such a record as the result of Kremlin's "attempts".

What if Lavrenty Pavlovich really had hidden talents, openly demonstrated by Alexander Pushkin and Sergei Yesenin? Brezhnev's "Chekist No. 1" Yuri Andropov and Gorbachev's "President of the USSR" Anatoly Lukyanov wrote poetry.

Even the hero of Stalingrad, Marshal Eremenko, once broke into a poem, as the poet Konstantin Simonov attests to. True, in the latter case, Simonov, to whom the commander of the Stalingrad Front, inspired by the victory he had just won, showed his "poem", dissuaded his "brother from Parnassus" from publishing his opus ...

So why should Marshal Beria also be a stranger to sometimes taking a sip from Ipokrena - a magical source of inspiration formed on Mount Helikon after Pegasus was hit with a hoof? ..

And not only take a sip, but also try to find grateful listeners and connoisseurs of their work among colleagues in the Politburo and the State Defense Committee...

That is, if the text of the diaries contained indications that Beria wrote poetry or composed symphonies, then even such indications could not be defined as the result of the Kremlin's "invention". What if, in the person of Lavrenty Beria, we really had the unrecognized Alexander Pushkin, or at least Yevgeny Yevtushenko-Gangnus?

No, only if another entry was later found in the text of the diaries, for example: "December 20, 1949. Finally, my poem "The Great Stalin in the Caucasus" was published in mass circulation by "Goslit" in a leather binding with a gold edge. Koba pre

67

He proposed to replace his pseudonym with "Sergei Pushkin". They issued it by the decision of the Council of Ministers, and published it in honor of the anniversary of Koba," then Professor Kozlov would have every reason to attribute such an entry to the third information layer of the diaries "discovered" by him and evaluate it as "an exceptionally conscious falsification."

But Professor Kozlov does not point to any such record. On the other hand, he falsely declares all the records attributed by him to the "third information layer" invented by him as falsification.

Oh well...

Let us sum up the result of Professor Kozlov's "layering" of the text of the diaries into three layers and the subsequent "treatment" of these layers.



Let's think about it: what did Professor Kozlov admit, naturally, without wanting it, as a result of his analysis?

And here's what's probably...

According to Professor Kozlov:

1. The text of Beria's diaries is divided into three information layers.
2. The first layer is fully confirmed by authentic and reliable documents.
3. The second layer is not directly confirmed by the documents, but does not contradict the documents.

And although the information of this second layer, as Professor Kozlov writes, is "indistinctly, if not at all" reflected "in genuine and reliable documentary historical sources", in accordance with my opponent's own assessment, we can talk about indirect confirmation of the - toric reliability and the second layer.

4. The third layer is not confirmed by any historical documents either directly or indirectly, but it is not refuted by them either!

In addition to all this, according to Professor Kozlov himself, the diaries have an impeccable chronology that completely coincides with reliable historical chronology.

Professor Kozlov's conclusion from his own statement turns out to be surprisingly illogical for some reason: "The diaries are the fruit of the Kremlin's concoction."

Oh well...

But in the three volumes of Beria's diaries there is also a fourth, so to speak, layer of information, which Professor Kozlov did not mention clearly not out of forgetfulness.

This layer is my detailed comments, references and notes to Beria's diaries. And this is a very big layer.

The original text of L.P. Beria occupies not so much space in the total volume of the publication. These entries, which is quite natural, are only a small part of what was included in the three volumes of the diaries. The main part of the three volumes is my own text, where I act as a commentator on the texts of L.P. Beria.

Such a ratio of commented text and comments and notes to the text is by no means such a rare case. For example, the entire correspondence of Ivan the Terrible with Prince Kurbsky takes about 50 pages of modern typographical text. However, the academic edition of the correspondence between Ivan the Terrible and Prince Kurbsky in the Literary Monuments series has a volume of more than 420 pages.

For 50 pages of the original text - 370 pages of preface, afterword, comments and notes.

Perhaps, they are approximately the same in the public

The text of Beria's diaries is the text of their author, that is, directly L.P. Beria, and the text of their commentator, that is, Sergei Brezkun (Kremlev).

And about this, the fourth, informational layer - the comments and notes of the publisher of Beria's diaries - Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Professor V.P. For some reason, Kozlov didn't actually say a word.

Oddly enough, Professor Kozlov did not in any way certify either the reliable, but hushed up historical information that I cite, nor my comments. He did not even try to disavow the vision of the era of Stalin and Beria, which is stated in the Kremlin's comments to Beria's diaries.

So why did Professor Kozlov choose to keep silent about all this?

We will talk about this topic in more detail later, but I will say something right away.

Everything related directly to historical information and data contained in the fourth information layer is absolutely reliable and authentic, since everything there is based on those documents that were published by colleagues of professor and corresponding member V.P. Kozlov already in the anti-Soviet, anti-communist, anti-Stalin and anti-Beria years.

That is, my comments, I dare to say, are not just some of my idle reasoning, but each time they are supported by accurate historical data and facts.

And all this beats the falsifying attempts of semi-official historians on the spot!

The truth of history - even that part of it that academic professors brought to light in scanty copies in expensive collections

70

documents and other printed sources, little available to the general public - not for these professors!

So they have to shut up...

We have to confine ourselves to reasoning and judgments instead of an accurate and objective reconstruction of the era of Stalin and Beria. After all, an accurate reconstruction is deadly for the current officialdom.

I have something else to say about this, and besides what has already been said, but - everything has its time and place.

I'll tell you all about it!

In the meantime, let me return to the analysis of the article by Professor Kozlov, who writes:

"It remains for us to answer two questions related to this documentary forgery: who is its author and why did he do it? The author of the forgery is betrayed by the legend about the discovery of Beria's "Personal Diary", comments on the text and the book "Beria. The best manager of the 20th century. All these three documents are united in their ideological predestination, in some cases they complement each other. The author of two of them does not hide his name. This is the Kremlin. It is no coincidence that in his preface to the publication he makes an important conclusion: "I must say that the work on preparing the diary of L.P. Beria for publication only strengthened my conclusions that I made earlier regarding Beria and his era" (vol. 1, p. 29). Therefore (? - S.K.), and the third document - Beria's "Personal Diary" - is the result of the same person's modelling."

Yeah...

The "strength", "logic" and "persuasiveness" of such "argumentation" reminded me of Eliza Doolittle.

The heroine of the play by Bernard Shaw "Pygmalion" and the popular musical "My Fair Lady" Eli

71

Za was convinced that the one who pulled off her aunt's hat, he "cocked" the aunt too, because "the public there" could "kill" even for a hatpin.

Here, too, on the grounds that Beria's personal diary, Kremlin's comments on its text, and Kremlin's book "Beria. The Best Manager of the 20th Century" are united not in their ideological purpose, of course (because, unlike semi-official historians, I don't fulfill anyone's orders), but in terms of ideological content, Professor Kozlov concludes that all three texts allegedly belong to the same same face.

But sorry! Kremlev evaluates the era of Stalin and Beria in all its main features in almost the same way as Stalin and Beria themselves would evaluate it. So why then, one might ask, should the assessments and thoughts of Beria and his commentator differ?

And how can they "in a number of cases" not complement each other, if all three texts are about the same thing, namely: about L.P. Beria, his activities, his life and the life of the country for which Beria worked?

I understand if Professor Kozlov cited, say, examples of direct or characteristic stylistic coincidences in the text of the diaries, which were first published in 2011, and the text of my book about Beria, first published in the spring of 2008. Then we could talk about something...

No, without conducting any textual analysis, Professor Kozlov nevertheless declares the authorship of Kremlev in all three cases.

Oh well...

And then - more! Professor Kozlov also acts as Wolf Messing, who allegedly knew how to guess the thoughts of the public, and declares:

72

"Two motives prompted him (Kremlev. - S.K.) to a documentary forgery: to show the reader Beria's "Personal Diary" the image of a humane statesman, caring for the good of the country, worried about his own and other mistakes, - with on the one hand, and a false documentary source allegedly discovered after the publication of his book "Beria. The best manager of the 20th century", to confirm the whole system of general and particular conclusions about the activities of this person in this book - on the other hand.

That's exactly what it says and is written. Not in the form of a question or a suggestion - they say, one must assume that Kremlev was inspired by this and that, or at least: most likely, the following considerations moved Kremlev, etc.

No, it's downright with a sergeant-major, and not with a professor's straightforwardness, it's thumped: it was the Kremlin's forgery that prompted ... and so on.

Well, it would be fine with assurances of forgery - after all, I cannot forbid Professor Kozlov to consider the diaries of L.P. Beria forgery. But to directly declare something on my behalf, in fact?!

With the Kremlin alive, without authority from the Kremlin, to publicly report that the Kremlin was motivated by certain considerations?!!

To declare this without having any grounds for it, except for Professor Kozlov's own thoughts?!!

This, sorry, is somehow not very professorial.

Or maybe, on the contrary, very much like a professor? After all, modern literary criticism, for example, is quite calm about the fact that Western supposedly literary masterpieces are not only full of what was previously called not

73

censorship, but are also published in "Rossiyaniya" with all the "abnormal" words without the obligatory earlier dots.

The non-normative in "Rossiyaniya" becomes normative, the deceitful becomes supposedly true, the vile becomes welcome...

Orwellianism, and nothing more.

So the bribes from Professor Kozlov are smooth.

This is, of course, more than sad. But for now, alas, this is a fact and signs of the Yeltsinoid "epoch".

But I'm not a Yeltsinoid! By what I am guided, let me answer for myself, but I have never needed, do not need and will not need in the future in idle academic interpreters and perverters of my motives!

So, on my own behalf, I declare that Professor Kozlov has a finger in the sky regarding my motives for publishing Beria's diaries and his other materials.

I was driven solely by the desire and desire to acquaint my compatriots with very - in my opinion - interesting materials that were at my disposal.

As for the alleged desire to "demonstrate to the reader Beria's Personal Diary the image of a human statesman who cares about the good of the country, worrying about his own and others' mistakes," such a desire could not be a real motivation for me in this case.

It could not be, firstly, because such a powerfully positive image of Beria is created by the entire array of reliable documentary information that has been published to this day, moreover, published already in the anti-Soviet and anti-communist period in the history of Russia.

74

Secondly, I have already worked hard to recreate the appearance and personality of the true Beria by writing the very voluminous book that Professor Kozlov mentions, namely, "Beria. The best manager of the 20th century.

Already after its publication, mastering new materials about L.P. Beria, I realized that even this book does not fully reveal the role and significance of Beria, although it has a volume of 800 pages of small text. Therefore, over and over again, I had a desire to supplement my book by developing it into a two-volume set.

Only my preoccupation with other topics, in particular the topics of Stalin, 1941 and 1945, did not allow me to realize this plan.

And if I had extra time, I would use it in this way - not for "making" Beria's "diaries", but in order, as Professor Kozlov writes, "to confirm the whole system of general and particular conclusions about the activities of » Beria, set out in my first book, an expanded version of it.

I had quite enough new reliable documentary and memoir data for this.

But the appearance at my disposal of the materials of "Pavel Lavrentievich" transformed my intentions, and those materials that I intended to use to expand the first book, I used to comment on the text of Beria's diaries.

It goes without saying that the appearance of the materials of "Pavel Lavrentievich" in my possession necessitated a huge new work with sources, but not for the "production" of Beria's diaries, but for their, if possible, the most complete and deep understanding

75

leniya, commenting, providing detailed notes, etc.

So Professor Kozlov was wrong here too.

There is not much left for me to say, because Professor Kozlov's article is coming to an end, which means that my analysis of its text itself is also coming to an end. And here begins - as for my taste - the most entertaining.

First, a word to Professor Kozlov:

"Kremlev's falsification fully corresponds to the typology of forgery of documentary historical sources. For example, in order to exclude a full-scale demonstration of a forgery - a genuine manuscript of Beria's diary - he invents a rather primitive and simple-hearted legend about its existence. Similar legends accompanied the forgeries of H.Kh. Dabelova, D.I. Minaeva, A.R. Ramensky and others. As in the case of other documentary forgeries, such as the "Diary of A. Vyrubova", the forger could not hide his dependence on genuine documentary historical sources. The desire of falsifiers, with the help of a "newly found documentary source", to give greater authority to their previous observations and conclusions is not new either - such a technique was resorted to, for example, by D.I. Mirolyubov, who created the "Vlesova book".

So, my opponent is once again trying to present Kremlev as a kind of clumsy falsifier, and the published materials of L.P. Beria - a mediocre result of the Kremlin's "invention" and an inept fake.

On the Web, along with many objective and benevolent assessments of the Diaries, there are also enough comments that simply expire with black malice both in relation to Beria and to  
relation

76

to the Kremlin. At the same time, the intellectual level of such comments does not differ from their emotional level - the level of zoological malice.

Well, to hell with them, God is with us.

However, Professor Kozlov is an academician, he is known for his work precisely on the analysis of historical hoaxes, etc., he is the author of the well-known books "Analysis of forgeries of historical sources of the 18th-19th centuries" and "Deceived, but triumphant Clio: Forgeries Written Sources on Russian History in the 20th Century" (the latter is also in my personal library).

And so, with all this, Professor Kozlov, speaking of the Kremlin as a primitive falsifier, operates with such not only well-known, but also big names - Dabelov, Minaev, Ramensky, Mirolyubov ...

Professor Kozlov refers to the famous fake "Vyrubova's Diary"... This "Diary", although it does not belong to the beloved maid of honor of the last Russian Empress,

many seriously considered and is considered as an interesting documentary source, as an adequate evidence of the era.

In my opinion, all this is somewhere even funny! And comparing me with such examples and putting my name on a par with the authors of major historical hoaxes even somehow raised me in their own eyes.

Wow - here is Dabelov and Shchegolev, but here is Kremlev!

Indeed, the examples cited by Professor Kozlov became classic and well-known precisely because the authors of the hoaxes possessed great professional qualifications, historical

77

erudition and such literary talent that, being writers themselves, they were able to hide their authorship and successfully mystify highly learned colleagues.

So let's do one of the two!

Or "The Diaries of Beria" belong to the pen of L.P. Beria, and then - what are we talking about?

Or these diaries are "diaries" in quotation marks and belong to the pen of Kremlyov. But then give the Kremlin its due, at least express praise to him through gritted teeth!

I emphasize that the above does not mean any of my confessions of forgery! My work on Beria's diaries consisted of preparing them for publication, commenting on them, and supplying them with extended notes and biographical notes.

But Professor Kozlov does not think so. And he doesn't even bother to praise the Kremlin, although he compares it with Da Belov ...

After all, but one can, perhaps, be proud of this.

However, I was not proud for long, remembering that Professor Kozlov devoted entire books to the opening of a number of hoaxes, and only one article, albeit in two journals, to the "opening" of the "hoax" of the Kremlin.

It's a shame...

Yes, it's a shame - even if we take into account that Professor Kozlov draws a parallel between D.I. Minaev, who invented "The Tale of Rus' and the Prophetic Oleg", U.P. Mirolyubov, who created the Vlesov Book, and me, declaring that the forger, like them, sought "with the help of" the newly found document

78

source" to give greater authority to their previous observations and conclusions.

Regarding the next "brilliant" "penetration" of Professor Kozlov into the thoughts and aspirations of the Kremlin, I will say that I did not have such a desire for the reasons I have stated above. I could quite successfully give greater authority to my previous observations and conclusions, simply by supplementing my book on Beria with such facts, data and figures that, with all my desire, could not be assessed as false.

So it doesn't work out from Professor Kozlov the new Wolf Messing ...

Joking aside, I'll tell you that in general, to evaluate the diaries of L.P. Beria Professor Kozlov used the following expressions:

"Speaking in the language of modern documentary source studies, Beria's "Personal Diary" is an enchanted textual legendary forgery of the escort type. If we are guided by the first formula of the typology of documentary falsifications - the goal achievement formula (initiation of the forgery + fabrication of the forgery = goals of the forgery) - the goal pursued by the forger becomes obvious: the rehabilitation of Beria, and through him - of Stalinism in general.

Moliere's tradesman in the nobility did not know what he was saying in prose. I confess that I also had no idea that such a magnificent, sonorous and scientific definition was being sought for my modest work.

The words "escort type" even alarmed me somewhere — what is the obvious champion of "democracy" and "human rights" Professor Kozlov alluding to? Democracy, after all, we now have a strict, so

79

say, with a human face, but a face hidden behind the visor of a police helmet ...

But I immediately calmed down, realizing that the professor meant only that Kremlev, they say, when "preparing a forgery", authentic documentary historical sources were "escorted", not allowing to evade genuine historical data, just like "guardsmen Beria" did not allow the column of "innocent Stalin-Beria victims" to deviate from the given direction of movement.

It seems that the respected professor forgot that he himself singled out not one, but three information layers in Beria's diaries: a) information that completely coincides with the documents; b) information that does not contradict the documents and is even indirectly confirmed by them; and c) information that is neither confirmed nor refuted by documents.

So, proceeding from Professor Kozlov's typology, only the first layer - if Professor Kozlov considers the diaries a forgery - he could formally classify as a "textual forgery of the escort type."

Already the second layer should be classified by Professor Kozlov as "unconvoyed", so to speak, "forgery", since, according to Professor Kozlov himself, available historical sources do not accompany, do not "escort".

As for the third layer, Professor Kozlov assessed this layer as a free invention of the Kremlin. It turns out that the third layer, based on the typology of Professor Kozlov, must be considered as being listed in general as a successful "escape".

Or am I wrong?

One way or another, but as an article by Professor Kozlov

wow, so my analysis of this article itself has almost completely come to an end. All that remains is the final paragraph of the article, which has not yet been quoted or analyzed by me.

And yet...

However, according to sound reasoning, I came to the decision to acquaint the reader with the last, summarizing paragraph of Professor Kozlov's article not now, but later, when considering the eighth topic "Academic historians against historical truth." There, an analysis of the final anti-Beria and anti-Kremlin (in the sense - against Sergei Kremlev, and not against Putin's Kremlin) passage from an article by Professor and Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences V.P. Kozlov will probably be more useful.

Now I will turn to an analysis of the accusations of another opponent, who accuses not the Kremlin of forging the diaries of L.P. Beria, but accuses L.P. Beria on the basis of recognition of the texts published by the Kremlin as authentic.

This refers to Dmitry Winter's book about Beria's diaries.

Theme P

A LITTLE ABOUT THE BOOK "STALIN AND BERIA - WAR CRIMINALS", AS WELL AS ABOUT "ACTIVISTS" FROM THE INTERNET...

As the reader already knows, less than a year after the publication of the third volume of L.P. Beria, the same Yauza publishing house that published the diaries published a book by Dmitry Winter with the demonstrative title Stalin and Beria are war criminals.

Winter's book was accepted by the editors of the Yauza publishing house for publication without much controversy and obstacles, which is just an example of a truly democratic approach to information. I doubt that the editors of Rodina and Voprosy istorii would also be willing to accept for publication that part of this book that is devoted to the analysis of an article by Professor Kozlov published in both journals.

"Democrat" Dmitry Winter and Professor Kozlov are in relation to Beria's diaries in, so to speak, "opposite phase". If an academic historian declares the diaries to be a fake by Kremlev, then Winter considers them authentic and wrote a whole book with an alleged analysis of the diaries. That is, Sergei Kremlev has, it would seem, reason to count

82

Dmitry Winter in allies at least in one position - in terms of assessing authenticity diaries.

However, I will not count Winter as an ally. It was long and cleverly said: "Deliver me, God, from friends, but I myself will somehow get rid of enemies." And this is exactly the same case.

I don't need dm. Winter is neither like a "friend" nor like an "ally" - at least in something. However, I do not count him among the enemies. I don't count simply because the enemy is serious, and Winter's "reasoning" about the era of Stalin and Beria is very frivolous, superficial and deceitful.

Dmitry Winter does not pull on the enemy.

But there is no doubt that Dmitry Winter is not my friend, but my enemy.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that in his "analysis" Winter proceeds from the authenticity of the diaries, that is, he believes that "The Diaries of Beria" were written by L.P. Beria.

And as they say, thank you.

I will not analyze Winter's book in the same detail and detail as I did in the case of Professor Kozlov's article. And not only because the analysis of a book and an article are very different things, primarily in terms of volume. It's just that Winter's book is so innocently ahistorical that it suffices to take a few examples from it. to understand the absurdity of the statements of its author.

In some respects, this not thick book can be called an encyclopedia of Stalin's most vicious slander on the USSR, on the Great Patriotic War... You can call the book by Dm. Winter and an encyclopedia of many gossips and absurdities that appeared to the needs of domestic dupes



in the last twenty years - from Hitler's "flying saucers", which allegedly shot down Soviet pilots, to the underground factories of "New Swabia" under the ice of Antarctica...

Actually, even the title "Stalin and Beria are war criminals" today, in the presence of quite a lot of objective literature about Stalin and Beria, about the USSR of Stalin and Beria, testifies to the extreme bias, anger and ignorance of the one who decided to write "labor" with the same name.

Therefore, I will not start with the book itself, and not even personally with Dm. Winter, but from a brief analysis of the appearance and moods of that social stratum, a typical representative of which is Dm. Winter, and many participants in various Internet forums.

After all, the type of embittered moods that Dm. Winter is characteristic, unfortunately, for a considerable number of those who surf the Web. And this is deadly for the future of Russia! After all, the most active, albeit not socially, but, so to speak, emotionally, part of society participates in discussions on the Web.

In addition, the majority of participants in Internet forums are young or relatively young, up to 40-45 years old, people.

The ignorant emotions of the young are a terrible thing under certain conditions.

When the French royalists returned to post-Napoleonic France in the wagon trains of the Alexander army and the royal power of Louis XVIII was restored in France, one intelligent person, looking at this mothballed riff-raff,

84

he aptly said, as he snapped: "They did not forget anything and did not learn anything."

Looking at many (alas, much more numerous than we would like) of their compatriots such as Dm. Winter, I remember this winged historical phrase, and I want to say: "They knew nothing, they did not want to learn anything, and they did not learn anything."

The last Tsar Nicholas began with the Khodynka catastrophe on May 18, 1896, which claimed thousands of lives, continued with the execution of the people on Bloody Sunday on January 9, 1905 and the Lena massacre on April 4, 1912 in Bodaibo, and then sent to slaughter in the name of the interests of the British French capital, millions of Russian homespun peasants in 1914 ...

On August 30, 1918, Vladimir Lenin accepted a poisoned bullet "for his friends", for the common people.

But for today's historical and spiritual ignoramuses, Vladimir Lenin is a damned "bloody" tyrant, and Tsar Nicholas is a saint...

Ugh!

Under Stalin, the economy picked up growth rates of almost 20% per year, under Khrushchev it slid down to about 6%.

A portrait of Stalin appeared in the main newspaper of the USSR, Pravda, in 1952 six times. Portrait of Khrushchev a year before it was removed, in 1963, almost one hundred and forty times.

But Stalin, for a certain section of our society who went crazy in the Gulag, is a "cult of personality", while Khrushchev is a "fighter against the cult" and "the creator of the "thaw"..."

The Soviet Union was the second power in the world and had a sure chance of becoming the first - the first not in doubtful and controversially calculated GDP, but in the first place.

howl for your international prestige and respect.

The current "Rossiyanian" in a systemic sense is more and more rapidly sliding down, producing less and more and more. As for authority and respect, "Rossiyanian" is not valued for a penny, not only by the outside world, but by "Rossiyanian" itself.

However, the standard answer of the winters to all this is: "Well, what? Enough gulags!"

Any objective comparison of even the Brezhnev USSR with Putin's RF will not be in favor of the latter, even if we take the statistics not of production, but of consumption!

For example, daily bananas in stores do not correct the bastard, unhealthy in comparison with Soviet times, food balance for the absolute majority of Russians. The herds of "foreign cars" on domestic roads are explained not by the growth in the well-being of the broad masses, but by the situation of the feast during the plague — with the only difference being that those feasting at Pushkin's are aware of their imminent end, while the "dear Russians" who get into loans are convinced that that ahead of them is not a disaster, but some kind of no, but life.

Winters do not want to see this at close range. And to this day it remains a mystery to me whether they are stupid and blind, so to speak, in good faith, whether they are disinterestedly mistaken, or yet they are not stupid, but sophisticated, Jesuitically, vile and slander the era of Stalin and Beria with a completely selfish purpose.

The mediocre catastrophic fires of 2010, the mediocre Sayano-Shushenskaya catastrophe, formed out of the blue, are not an alarm signal for the wind turbines. They don't even think  
mo

It may come that this or that Volga dam may collapse, for example, with the formation of Volga tsunamis with the "domino" effect, when a tsunami from one collapsed dam will destroy another.

This is not excluded, and it is not excluded only because the state itself is now engaged in the destruction of the economy and society.

And then it will be too late! The world is really arranged in such a way that "everything is possible in it", but after that nothing can be corrected.

However, the winterers prefer not to notice this and talk about the slave labor that created these  
dams...

Eh!

The "moment of truth", of course, will come one way or another. But those who are preparing the death of Russia are not afraid of this. They fear that the moment of truth will come before they secure the point of no return. The later the emotionally active part of the population realizes how they are being deceived and "divorced", the greater the chance that the point of Russia's "no return" to full-fledged development will actually be passed.

For this, the people are told that Peter did not give Russia anything needed, that he only flooded "Orthodox Rus" with blood and was "the first Bolshevik on the throne."

To do this, they put Stolypin on a pedestal and overthrow Lenin.

To do this, they slander Stalin, Beria and the party of Bolshevik-Stalinists (not "communists" - Brezhnev), who, together with the people, created a great power for the people ...

The Winters do not want to understand (or perhaps they themselves understand something, but do not let others understand) that social

Lism was Russia's hope. They do not want to understand that the Soviet system collapsed not because it was not viable, but precisely because it had a potentially huge vitality that was deadly for the world's capitalist elite.

The smart work of capital to undermine and disintegrate the labor movement, which began even before October 1917 and even before the creation of the Bolshevik Party, and then the same work to undermine socialism, as well as the inescapable anti-social position, the extremely low level of social responsibility of the "racial" intelligentsia and the low general and social culture of the masses, which we have not overcome, became the main reasons for the collapse of the USSR.

But can you learn from mistakes?

Alas, so far Russia not only does not learn from its mistakes, but is also unwilling to do so.

And the main reason is the brains polluted by winters.

Of course, one can say: why did Russia take on the "socialist" "tug" if it turned out to be not a hefty one?

So after all, it was not we who were taken, but our great-grandfathers, grandfathers and fathers! And they turned out to be hefty! They won the wars, created a powerful industry and great Soviet culture, launched the Tu-104 into the sky, and Gagarin and the Mir orbital station into space, sent the world's first nuclear icebreaker Lenin into the Arctic ice, and then nuclear icebreaker "Soviet Union"

Thinking like the winters, we can say that Peter was stupid - why did he win the Baltic states from the Swedes? All the same, after all, there are no Baltic states in the composition of Russia now.

But is it Peter's fault?

And Catherine was, it turns out, stupid, including the Crimea in Russian borders ...

Pavel and Alexander the First acted no smarter - according to a similar "logic" - in the development of Russian America ... Was it worth encouraging this process, was it worth undertaking the first Russian round-the-world trips to distant lands! .. After all, Alaska was sold anyway.

No, each generation must be responsible primarily for its own actions! When our ancestors undertook great deeds, they were sure that their descendants would, firstly, be proud of them, and secondly, they would continue great deeds based on the achievements of their ancestors.

Lenin led a country that was not ready for socialism to a socialist revolution, but the honest and faithful policy of the Bolshevik Party gave the country great prospects.

Stalin led the country first to the foundations of socialism, and then to the foundations of communism with the people, a considerable part of which, even in the early 50s, was neither psychologically nor socially ready for an increasingly meaningful life. However, Stalin counted on the fact that the course towards education and Soviet democracy would bear fruit in the form of an increasingly mature and responsible Soviet society for the present and future.

However, the new Soviet elite, which, having emerged from the people, had to continue its course towards the total anti-elitist nature of Soviet society, turned out to be susceptible to subversive work from the outside and to decay from within.

That's what it's time to understand and draw conclusions from this. And the winters and precocious Internet "activists"

those who have read the winders, the Volkogonovs, the Radzins, the "Suvorovs" and other intellectually thieving "thieves", keep sawing and sawing branches...

On which, by the way, they themselves sit.

Here I am reading an article published in the same 2nd issue of Rodina magazine for 2012 about the observer of the magazine Lev Anninsky "The Being of the World and the Life of an Exiled Settler" with the subtitle "Feelings and thoughts when visiting the dwelling of I.V. Stalin."

I read, experiencing not only a feeling of disgust and almost physical nausea, but also a feeling of extreme and deep amazement ...

Is it really possible to publish such not only vile, but such anti-historical, historically and morally illiterate nonsense today in a journal that claims to be historical?!

Here is the leitmotif of Anninsky's "reflections":

"... I kept waiting, passing through these memorial apartments, to see at least some hint of terror, of the irreversibility of sentences, of the ruthlessness of the Gulag (for Anna's GULAGs, this is not the Central Committee of the NKVD, but something collective, infernal, that's why they always write exactly like this: "Gulag" - S.K.).

Not a hint. All this is elsewhere. In another world...

Why, Comrade Generalissimo, he personally did not send a single person to the next world, that is, he did not shoot, blew up, strangled ...

How to combine modesty (heck, even Anninskys do not risk portraying Stalin as a naughty person from Courchevel. - S.K.) of a quiet exiled settler and the calmness of an omnipotent dictator who noticed that the death of one person is, of course, a tragedy, but the death of millions - is this a statistic?

Stalin was not a dictator, and Stalin did not "notice" anything of the sort. In such categories

I never thought - that's how the "shtatovskie" thought

90

planners of real "carpet" bombing attacks on the population of Germany in 1944 and 1945 and virtual atomic bombing attacks on the cities of the USSR after the war...

The very idea, undoubtedly deep and true, that if the death of one person is perceived by others as a tragedy, then the death of millions is perceived surprisingly calmly, belongs, if I am not mistaken, to the German pacifist writer Erich Maria Remarque.

But what about Anninsky?

Joseph Stalin for them - "executioner". But Vladimir Putin, who continued Boris Yeltsin's course of Russia's extinction, is a "reformer."

And as for Mikhail Gorbachev, this is generally a "great man".

And what? He did not repress anyone, he did not frighten anyone, he was eloquent, many liked him - in America, in Europe ... The Germans even included him in the "best Germans".

But if you think about it, Gorbachev is one of the two main executioners of the whole world.

The second is Yeltsin.

And nothing, no one calls them "bloody tyrants"...

N-yes...

However, it is time to pay a little attention to the book of Dm. Winter. He began with a verbose denunciation of the historical "ignorance" of Sergei Kremlev, and on this

stay.

Winter writes:

"... I will only note ... one aspect that characterizes S. Kremlev as a historian. Summing up the activities of Stalin's entourage, he writes that "Judas Khrushchev in

91

new Russia, which, if it lives, will again be Allied, Soviet, Socialist and sovereign, deserves the fate of the Tushino thief, who was dug up, burned and then shot from a cannon "...

...So, for the information of Mr. Kremlev, it was not False Dmitry I, who was nicknamed the Tushinsky thief ..., but False Dmitry | .TO.). It is a shame not to know this, all the more so for a person who positions himself as a historian and as a patriot of Russia..."

Then DM. Winter begins, by the way, "subtle hints at what no one knows" ... And these hints boil down to the fact that de Kremlev's surname "Brezkun" could be remade in such a way that it will be, as Dm writes . Winter, "his real name."

Well, what's dark! It is clear that, flirting with an unpronounced flat pun, Dm. Winter alludes to the "Libber" variant. Oh, yes, I would take Dm. Winter would have written that! I wouldn't go to court to sue...

Being principled on trifles is the principle of petty people, and I don't consider myself one of those – whether someone likes it or doesn't like it.

But I would have had even more fun - if my "opponent" had "punned" to the end ...

Oh, "Dimitri's" Vinters!

As for the two most famous impostors in Russian history, here I am Dm. Winter really did get away! I always confuse them - these two "false Dmitrys" of that time, or rather, they, as a rule, merge for me (and, I hope, not only for me) into something single. After all, the main thing in both was one thing - they were traitors to Russia and puppets of the interventionists ...

But the Tushinsky thief, no doubt, is False Dmitry II, and False Dmitry I is the impostor Grishka Otrepyev, and it was his ashes that were fired from a cannon in Moscow.

Here Dmitry Winter is absolutely right, and Sergey Kremlev made an unfortunate "blunder".

But here's what's interesting!

Of course, I made a "blunder", although not a fundamental one - after all, Otrepyev was also a "thief", although he did not camp in the village of Tushino. But the fact that the Polish (and even the Vatican!) henchman, the foreign puppet Otrepyev for Dm. Winter "the man and the ruler are not at all bad", this is, without a doubt, important! This reveals, as I understand it, the sgedo ("creed") of Dm. Winter, his line of life, his, so to speak, "principled course" towards political and civilizational servility to the supposedly "enlightened" and "civilized" West.

Well, in Russian history we have dealt with such a "line of life" more than once... As before both False Dmitry impostors - "dotushinsky" and "tushinsky", and after them, up to the present Mutny the time when political puppets, unlike the Tushinsky thief, managed to take the Kremlin.

Returning once again to Dmitry Winter's assessment of Grishka Otrepyev as "not a bad person at all", let me remind the reader of an indicative episode from J. Rolling's book "Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix"... In response to the praises of the "toad" professor Umbridge to the unlucky Defense Against the Dark Arts teacher Quirrell, Harry Potter rightly remarked that Professor Quirrell was a really great teacher, here

only had a "small" flaw - he had the Dark Lord Voldemort sticking out of the back of his head ...

It looks like Dm. Both of his infamous namesakes stick out of the back of Winter's head.

"That's right, but...

However, the reader has the right to note that all this is good and wonderful, but it would not hurt the Kremlin to get to the point. That is, to the answer of Dm. Winter on the merits of his accusations - based on the diaries of Beria and comments on them - Stalin, Beria and (oh, what a flattering honor to be enrolled in such a company even by Dm. Winter) Kremlev.

Well, let's dwell on this for a bit...

As I said, in general, the book of Dm. Winter is a collection of gossip and absurdities, so I do not intend to bore myself and the reader with their detailed analysis. But there are some things that can and should be said.

For example, Dm. Winter writes (p. 30):

"... on the White Sea Canal during the winter of 1931/32, it is believed that 100 thousand died - 100% of the original number of prisoners at the construction site! .."

Dm. Winter reproaches me for not giving references to sources, although I usually give them, but not in footnotes, but directly in the text. And now in the main text I will inform you that there is such a collection of documents "Stalin's GULAG construction projects. 1930-1953", published in 2005 by the democratic International Fund "Democracy" (Alexander N. Yakovlev Fund).

It is impossible to reproach this Foundation and its adherents with love or at least a minimally objective attitude towards Stalin, Beria and the era of Stalin. This Foundation accepts only anti-Soviet, anti-Communist

94

stov and renegades such as "Tushino flights", but "flights" in one direction - to a satisfying feeder. For clarification as to who the "Tushino flights" are, I refer the reader to a major expert on the Tushino thief, Dm. Winter.

So, dm. Winter, not suspecting that he is whipping himself in the manner of Gogol's non-commissioned officer's widow, ingenuously remarks:

"In general, the Kremlin's comments provide data on the death rate of prisoners in the camps, taken ... from nowhere and ridiculously low ... lower than in the wild in modern Russia (1.4%) ..."

I inform you, "Dmitry Frantsevich", Georgy Yuryevich or whatever you like, that I took these data from ... your fellow falsifiers of history, from a collection of documents published by them.

Only these brethren of a higher class are burdened with scientific degrees and titles, and in scientific small-circulation and expensive publications they are forced to cite genuine archival information.

And it is in the collection of documents mentioned above regarding the mortality of prisoners on the White Sea Canal that the following is reported:

"... During the years of construction of the BBVP (White Sea-Baltic Waterway. — S.K.), the death rate among the prisoners of the Belbaltlag was as follows: in 1931, 1438 people died, or 2.24% of the average annual number of prisoners in the camp. In 1932, 2010 people died, or 2.03% of the average annual number of prisoners. In 1933, 8870 prisoners died, or 10.564% of the average annual camp population. The causes of high mortality in 1933 were famine in the country, a sharp deterioration in the nutrition of prisoners in the camp ... "

By adding the figures given by the Yakovlev Foundation and comparing the amount received with the White Sea-Baltic "data" of Dm. Winter suggest the reader to do it yourself.

I will note that this is the analysis of the book by Dm. Winter could, perhaps, be finished.

However, let's continue...

What is, say, Winter's "statistics" about the losses of the Red Army in 1941: one and a half million allegedly "passed over to the Germans in two months (! - S.K.) of the war", two and a half million were allegedly taken prisoner (even Hitler in the fall of 1941 cited the figure as substantially less than two million), "two million simply ran away."

Read this and you won't believe your eyes! Paper will endure everything, but why not be ashamed to subject poor paper to such trials?

For information about the losses of 1941, I refer the reader to a number of reference publications of recent years or, if desired, to my own book "10 Myths about 1941" (there is also a publication called "Is Stalin to Blame for the Tragedy of 1941").

I will give, perhaps, another example of the historical and statistical "calculations" of Winter - regarding the period of the Soviet-Finnish war of 1939-1940 (p. 48):

"Understandably, Kremlin expresses fears that tiny Finland (whose population at that moment was less than the population of Leningrad alone) may fire at our "second capital" from the border with its long-range artillery..."

etc.

First, Finland is far from being a tiny country. For comparison: the area of Belgium is 30.5 thousand square meters. km; Netherlands - 41.5 thousand square meters km; France — 550 thousand sq. m. km; Germany - 357 thousand. sq. km.

And the area of even present-day Finland is 337 thousand square meters. KM.

Secondly, the population of Leningrad in 1939 numbered 3401 thousand people, and without urban settlements subordinated to the Lensoviet - 3119 thousand people. The population of Finland, according to the 1940 census, was 3,887 thousand people.

Thirdly, at that time in Finland, not so few adults, not in psychiatric hospitals, but at public meetings, called for the creation of a "great Finland" "before the Urals".

Such forces could indeed even foolishly bombard Leningrad themselves. But then England and France stood behind them. Both of these powers initially incited the Finns to take a "hard line" during the Soviet-Finnish negotiations on the 1939 border, and then intended to send an expeditionary force to Finland and even bomb Baku...

Yes, and Germany, having designed the Mannerheim Line for the Finns, could well at some point enter into an alliance with the Finns and threaten Leningrad precisely with long-range artillery.

Actually, that's exactly what happened later! In the outbreak of the war between Germany and the USSR, "tiny" Finland did not take a reasonable position of neutrality, but immediately, to the best of its ability, began its own, albeit bloody, but farcical "revenge".

This, of course, is not worth poking the same Finns in the nose - these people deserve respect. But we, Russians, should not forget about such a past either.

I don't know why, but Dm. Winter Russian on

97

the family does not really like it (and the Soviet one cannot stand it at all), but it loves very much not only the Finns, but also, for example, the Poles. Perhaps this is due to the spiritual kinship with the "good man" and "not bad ruler" False Dmitry 1, that is, Grishka Otrepyev. Therefore, Dm. Winter recklessly "defends", for example, anti-Soviet Poles from Anders' future army. Those who fled to English Iran instead of demonstrating to the whole world the Polish "Gor's prowess" under the Russian Stalingrad.

The "bloody tyrant" Stalin, who put a lot of effort and money into Anders's army, only shrugged his shoulders about the flight of the "arrogant gentlemen", but did not detain the "heroes" in Russia. But the British, "the bulwark of democracy and justice," later calmly used the "Andersites" as "cannon fodder" and "human shields" in Italy near Monte Cassino, whose bloody poppies are still sung in Poland to this day.

And with all that, Dm. Winter turns his tongue to talk about the alleged half-century "occupation" of Poland - at first, as he writes, "...Soviet-Nazi, then purely Nazi, then, finally, purely Soviet"...

"Soviet-Nazi occupation" Winter calls the reunification with the motherland of the lands of Western Ukraine and Western Belarus, torn away by Poland from the RSFSR and the Ukrainian SSR under the Riga Treaty of 1921.

I'm already tired of reminding all sorts of winters and others over and over again! There were no Polish "Eastern kreses", but there were primordial Russian lands, which even the English Minister of Foreign Affairs

strange affairs Curzon recognized as Russian, proposing an ethnically justified Russian-Polish border along the so-called Curzon Line.

Heard dm. Winter about this? Today, the Polish-Belarusian and Polish-Ukrainian borders mostly pass through it ...

Responsibility even for the Nazi occupation Winter puts again on Stalin. And then he lays responsibility on Stalin for the "purely Soviet occupation" right up to 1989. It is Winter who similarly assesses the time when Poland, in alliance with the USSR, for the first time in its history created a society that provided for the interests of ordinary working people in a way that never happened before!

I won't hold back, and I'll say it straight, I was especially disgusted by Winter's description of the supposedly unparalleled "heroic resistance" of the Poles against the backdrop of insinuations against us.

Yes, the best part of the Polish people really fought heroically near Westerplatte, near Warsaw and later together with the Red Army. And eternal glory to these Poles for this!



But this was not only the best, but also tragically the smallest part of the nation. In general, the Poles as a nation collapsed in two weeks without much resistance to the aggressor, which unequivocally proved the rottenness of society (the French will demonstrate such rottenness and unpreparedness for resistance in less than a year).

But for the freedom of Poland, for Poland to receive huge post-war increments of its territory, more than six hundred (!) Thousand Soviet soldiers gave their lives! The Poles,

having fought

Since 1939, on the fields of all the battles of the Second World War, including Monte Cassino, they did not pay for the Victory even a third of the Russian price paid for Poland.

and DM. Winter has the audacity after that...

Eh!

At the same time, Winter writes about the facts of the atrocities of the Poles Anders in Central Asia, recorded by the documents of the joint commissions, as about "supposedly" former.

Alas, the atrocities were in fact. Citing archival documents published already in anti-Soviet times in the Russian Archive series, I wrote about this in my book Myths about 1945.

And here is another demonstrative passage from the book of Dm. Winter, taken almost at random (this is a quote about the Franco-German war and the French):

"... a significant part of the "intelligentsia, ready to surrender without a fight," were French communists, who, after signing the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, on instructions from the Comintern, adopted a resolution on the "defeat of their government in the imperialist war," for which, by the way, the FKP was banned on September 26, 1939. Soviet historians were very fond of savoring the fact of the ban... but, of course, they kept silent about its reason..."

Here Winter follows, for example, Churchill and even outdoes him in spitting on the French Communists. Churchill wrote after the war:

"Hitler was convinced that the French political system was rotten to the ground and infected the French army (here Hitler was absolutely right, and the army was infected with rot by the bourgeois system, and not

100

FKP. - S.K.). He knew the power of the Communists in France, he knew that it could be used to weaken or paralyze action as soon as Ribbentrop and Molotov reached an agreement and Moscow condemned the British and French governments for having entered into a capitalist and imperialist war. ."

Indeed, the British and French governments at first provoked Poland with promises of all-round support for a war with Germany, and then they themselves entered into precisely that capitalist and imperialist war.

But it's not about that now, but about the fact that on September 3, 1939, the English Communist Party, say, the Communist Party adopted a manifesto that demanded from the working people all possible support for the war against the fascist aggressor and, at the same time, struggle to overthrow the government of the "appeasers" and replace it. others.

The Chamberlain government in the same days categorically forbade the bombing of military installations in the territory of the Ruhr on the grounds that this was supposedly private property. Incidentally, the very same Churchill writes about this.

As for the PCF, on August 25, 1939 (already after the signing of the Soviet-German pact of August 23, 1939), the newspaper of the Communist Party "Humanite" published a statement of the PCF, which said: "In a genuine struggle against the fascist aggressor, the Communist Party defends their right to be in the forefront."

And on September 21, 1939, another communist organ, Vie Ouvre, prophetically warned: "A government that fears the people is going to defeat."

In March 1940, the French authorities began

101

trial of 44 communist deputies of parliament. At the same time, the communist deputy Etienne Fajon was not sitting on the dock, but on the witness bench of the Palace of Justice, where he was taken in military uniform - straight from the front.

The whole "trial" lasted half an hour - then the judges announced that the trial was adjourned without announcing a date for the resumption of the trial. That is, in the five months that have passed since the FKP was banned, the prosecution has not been able to collect the slightest bit of convincing material, not only for the prosecution, but even for the conduct of the trial.

Too bad DM wasn't there. Winter! He would have tossed some "material" to the French judges.

And here is another "discovery" of Dm. Winter..

I don't know if I should comment, but I completely refuse to comment on his statement that Stalin needed an atomic bomb "for the war for world domination." To enter into polemics with such insinuations means to indirectly denigrate the heroic, often sacrificial, efforts of those who in the shortest possible time eliminated the US atomic monopoly and saved, perhaps, not only Russia from atomic bombings.

Yes, sometimes the "reasoning" and "conclusions" of Dm. They give away Winter, sorry, explicit, how to say it softer...

However, let the reader judge for himself. Here is what Dm. Winter on p. 94:

"... In December 1941, Hitler declared war on the United States, because he realized (this is in 1941. — S.K.) that the war was lost, and decided to take revenge on Stalin in this way, bringing the Americans to Europe and stealing from Stalin the greater and better part of the results of the victory..."

102

I had to read a lot of stupid and vile things about the Great Patriotic War, but I didn't have to read more stupid nonsense and I'm unlikely to have to in the future. This nonsense cannot even be defined as political and historical paranoia.

And then DM. Winter begins to retell yet another nonsense that he has become very fond of – about allegedly created by the Germans either before the hardest war that required economic strain, or during the hardest war of a certain "New Swabia" under the ice of Antarctica.

Only since the 1950s, the mighty USA and the USSR, at the cost of considerable efforts and expenditure of funds, were able to cling to the Southern continent with just a few ground-based scientific stations with scanty, in fact, "autonomy" in quotation marks, completely dependent on supplies from a distant Big land...

However, screwers intrepidly inform the ingenuous public, confident that wooden bolts are better than steel bolts, because it is lighter that:

"...foreseeing defeat in the war, the leaders of the Third Reich began to evacuate secret industries outside Europe that produced high-tech military products

meanings..."

And they transported - according to Winter - all these caravans "to Antarctica", and the allies "did not interfere" with this, because it was allegedly necessary for the USA and England that "German scientists ... take their developments to Antarctica .."

That's where Hitler fled.

Everything, dear reader! From now on, when faced with this or that nonsense, I undertake the obligation to use non-classical

103

the old idiom "the elder in the garden, and the uncle in Kyiv", and the new version, "inspired" by Dm. Winter: "In Antarctica - pineapples, and under Antarctica - Hitler."

I can suggest to Winter another version of cargo transportation for "New Swabia" - right through the center of the Earth, inside of which there is another Earth, only larger, as a certain crazy school teacher informed Schweik.

At one time, Gogol's hero Poprishchin "discovered" that "China and Spain are absolutely one and the same land, and only out of ignorance consider them to be different states."

So the winters, developing the ideas of Poprishchin, assure us that Germany and Antarctica with its "New Swabia" are "completely one and the same land." No, the titular adviser Poprishchin was, whatever you say, a head. It's just a pity that not everything was in order with this head ...

But Poprishchin, mournful in his head, didn't think of one thing – Hitler's "flying saucers" shooting down Soviet MiGs, Yaks and Laggs.

And here is DM. Winter surpassed everything and ... thought of it! He placed a whole chapter in his book under the title "UFOs against Stalin's falcons"?

What is it?

Hartman's UFO against Pokryshkin's "cobra" - even Hollywood, much like "spreading cranberries", has never ventured into such a plot! Although, according to Dm. Winter, a certain "American ufologist of Bulgarian origin V. Terzisha ..." lives in the USA, who talks about space bombings of the USSR as early as 1941.

I don't understand one thing - how is Hitler and Goering not

104

did you think to enroll the Brocken witches on high-speed brooms into the states of the Luftwaffe?

And speaking seriously, the question is, is it possible to take all this seriously and comment seriously?

So it's up to you, dear reader, but my reserves of readiness to analyze the "analyses" of Dm. Winters are exhausted. Over and over again, he demonstrates such morally and intellectually inverted ideas about truth and falsehood, about the motives and causes of certain historical events and actions of historical persons, that it is just as boring and tedious to analyze all the "revelations" of Winter. how to walk through a hopeless swamp.

I'm tired of walking along it, firstly, myself, and secondly, I don't want to tire the reader anymore.

I'll just point out one more thing...

Us. 144 Dm. Winter states:

"... If we get rid of emotions (well, well! - S.K.), then in the bottom line from the Kremlin's pearl we get this: ... the USSR rested only on continuous terror (Winter's emphasis in bold italics. - S.K. .). I emphasize: this is not true, other critics of Stalin said, it is the Stalinist Kremlin who says so!..»

etc.

Of course, the "Stalinist" Kremlyov never said anything of the sort and never will. And not even because he is a "Stalinist", but because such a statement about terror as the foundation of the USSR is absolutely anti-historical and does not correspond to reality for any, even for the most severe, period of Soviet history.

105

However, that's how it's written!

And this is surprising...

Well, I understand if Winter summed up his reasoning in the following way: "This follows logically from what the Stalinist Kremlev writes..." and so on. Here bribes would be smooth - well, what can you do, this is what Dm has. Winter's illogical "logic", and that's it!

But logic is reasoning. Reasoning, perhaps sound, perhaps - if we are dealing with "logic" in quotes - stupid ...

And to take it straight and thump: "This is the Kremlin talking..."?

It's already a statement.

A statement can be true or false. A false statement is slander.

And for libel, you can invite to court.

Of course, I have never quarreled with anyone and do not intend to quarrel. But I cannot fail to note that in his desire to speak for the Kremlin while the Kremlin was alive, the "liberalist" Dmitry Winter outdid even Professor Kozlov.

And one more thing...

Today in our lives there are enough stupid and sadly funny things, but for the sphere of book publishing Winter's case is, of course, "extreme". Most often, such opuses remain in manuscripts or in printer printouts and it does not reach the printing press. But, as I understand it, the Yauza publishing house provided an opportunity for Dm. Winter to declare his "position" with a full-length book, primarily because there was a really special case here.

The fact is that on the "diaries of Beria" and so "ve

106

poop" a lot of "dogs", and if the publishing house had rejected the manuscript of Dm. Winter, then the universal noise and din could rise: "Ah! .. You are afraid of the truth!"

Well, then - throw out your "truth"!

They threw it out, but in reality there was nothing to cover it with - except perhaps for the squadrons of UFO Luftwaffe, starting to "space bombardment" of the USSR from ice bases from the Antarctic "New Swabia" ...

Comparing the "Professor Kozlov's theme" and "Winter's theme" at the same time, one discovers a certain paradox.

Professor Kozlov announces the diaries of L.P. Beria is a "fake", but at the same time does not claim that the positive image of Beria, which is visible from the diaries, is not confirmed by historical data.

Dm. Winter announces that the diaries of L.P. Beria is genuine, but at the same time he claims that from the text of the diaries it is precisely that "bloody executioner", "despot", etc. that peeps through.

Interesting!

Two people...

Both, I don't know for what reasons and circumstances, are anti-Soviet.

Both, although with different strength and passion, have a negative attitude towards the era of Stalin, towards Stalin himself and his colleague Beria.

Both analyzed the same text.

And such different conclusions ...

Of course, the historical and intellectual qualifications of Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Kozlov and the stupid amateur Vinter differ in the most obvious way. But still...

107

I invite the reader to ponder this interesting psychological phenomenon for themselves. I will dwell on something else.

It would be possible not to dwell on the "Winter theme" in such detail if he were not, in my opinion, a very typical representative of a certain social and psychological stratum of the population... This stratum has formed in our society in recent years. one and a half to two decades as a result of the widespread use of the Internet and its forums.

At the beginning of the consideration of the "Winter topic", I already wrote that the majority of participants in Internet forums are young or relatively young people. Actually, Dm. Winter is not so old, as far as I know, he is not even fifty years old.

I do not know his biography, but judging by his age (if I am not mistaken, Dmitry Vinter was born around the 60s), it is clear that the formation of Dm. Winter as an individual began back in the years of the outwardly stable USSR, but the final intellectual formation took place in the years when Soviet power and socialism began to be discredited, and Soviet history began to be distorted and falsified with the encouragement or connivance of the top leaders themselves formally more Soviet power.

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Gorbachev and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR Lukyanov...

Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Ryzhkov and President of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic Yeltsin...

Chairman of the KGB of the USSR Kryuchkov, one of his

deputies Bobkov, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPSU Yakovlev, etc.

These above-named (as well as even more unnamed) traitors to the Soviet Motherland, highly placed by the Soviet government in the highest positions in the state and society, are, of course, morally and legally responsible for the historical, intellectual and anti-patriotic corruption of the minds and souls of the then growing up or young generations, including the generation of Dm. Winter.

For a receptive, but unstable and not taught to think and analyze mind, it was not so easy to withstand the conditions of total state pollution of minds and souls...

(Let me note in brackets that for some reason the process of polluting minds is often called "brainwashing", which for me personally was and remains incomprehensible, because clean, brainwashed is just the best guarantee against manipulating public consciousness.)

Yes, it was not easy in the conditions of the "catastrophe" to acquire the ability to think and resist the state-organized, informational "tsunami", whose task was to completely destroy the objective mass perception of the entire Soviet history, but especially of the Stalin era.

Many did not survive.

And then?

And then, already in the Yeltsin and Yeltsin era, the anti-Soviet and anti-communist information "tsunami" spilled over into a boundless "ocean" of social stupidity. And in this "ocean" the "shell" of Yeltsinoid lawlessness easily keeps afloat...

Not knowing the ford, not having faithful life and co

social landmarks, those who in 1991 were "between two and five", as well as those who were not in the world then, as they grew up ("..as they grow up" I can't say) rushed ignorance into this dirty "ocean".

And in order not to drown in it, they seized on the supposedly "lifeline" of the Internet forums...

On the one hand, it was quite understandable and natural. According to their human history, that is, developed by millions of years of history, people are collectivists. Otherwise, they would not have become human after a long biological evolution.

Dividing people is the task of Satan and world Capital, because the unification of honest working people is disastrous both for the goals of the Horned One and for the unrighteous prosperity of the Rich.

However, the nature of people pushes them to each other, and in modern conditions, when the state separates people, young people have found a "way out" in electronic "communication". More precisely, this "exit" was cleverly slipped to them.

And the brains of many turned out to be not washed out, but washed away.

And just like that, with their brains washed off, which they then diligently began to stuff with anti-Soviet "dung," new generations began to master the past...

And along with the provocative ones, ignorant Internet exposures of the "damned" "Stalinism" began. And truthful counterarguments were perceived by many - I don't know why

not really.

Alas!

Of course, after all the anti-Soviet

110

ears buzzed that the “damned” Stalin supposedly killed one hundred million innocent Dm. Winter, “ridiculously low ... lower than in the wild in modern Russia.”

In addition, the “activists” of the Internet, who were carried away by fashionable anti-Sovietism, did not themselves read small-circulation collections of declassified documents. And those who read them and found there data refuting the anti-Soviet people were not believed.

It turned out that in their native country there are enough of those who passionately would like to hear from someone or proclaim themselves that twice two is not four, but when it is three, when it is five...

And when - and seven whole, forty hundredths.

Ah, how original!

Ah, how new!

Doesn't this correspond to historical truth?

So what!

It's "So what!" it just kills me...

Come on, to hell with him, with this inconvenient Kremlin, he will kill himself like that ... But this is the sacramental current “So what!” kills the future of Russia!

But it is, after all, this future can be either catastrophic or socialist.

Tegyit pop dayog (“No third is given”), as the ancients used to say.

All serious social processes in any society, divided into owners of capital and those who provide these owners with their capital

111

tal, — all, I repeat, all serious social processes have a class content.

There is no absolute justice, there is no justice for all—everything is class! And since the main public funds are concentrated in the hands of the propertied capitalist proprietors, history is presented to the broad masses in the way that the propertied classes need. As Father Brown used to say, half of the politics of the rich now consists in deceiving the people.

In a class society, there is an absolute majority of those who live only on the means earned by their personal labor. And there is an absolute minority of those who fully or partially live on funds not earned by personal labor.

The basic interests of some and the basic interests of others in class capitalist society not only do not coincide, but are directly opposed to each other.

For the former, an honest social division is beneficial.

For the second - no.

This is, of course, a boring truth, but it is the truth.

And anyone who tries to explain social processes in a different way is only capable of — in the apt expression of one French historian — cooking cat stew.

For example, Winter accuses Stalin and Beria of carrying out repressions without observing all traditional procedural norms. However, one cannot approach one epoch with the standards of another epoch.

This is both stupid and mean!

112

There is such a thing - the laws of war. After all, no one is indignant at the fact that during the war the court-martial judges quickly and the sentence is carried out immediately. And in the era of Stalin and Beria, there was just a great battle for a mighty state, for a new life, for a new - free and educated - man of the masses.

Free due to the fact that he is fully, comprehensively educated! After all, in the era of Stalin there were only two really mass and genuine cults, encouraged in every possible way by the Stalinist state itself - the cult of children and the cult of education.

And the formation of the masses is deadly for tyrants.

So was Stalin a tyrant?

And were those freedom fighters who then interfered with Stalin, who fought against the new life or messed with it, and whom the politician Stalin was forced (forced by historical necessity!) To eliminate from life, in which he was forced to help the Chekist and the politician Beria?

No, the enemies of Stalin and Beria were at the same time enemies of human freedom and the human spirit.

When will today's Russia understand this?

And will he understand?

It has long been said: "The darkness of low truths is dearer to us than the uplifting deceit." However, the current, psychologically and morally inverted, anti-historical, perverted times can be characterized in a fundamentally different way: "The darkness of low truths is dearer to us than degrading deceit."

For some reason, this is how it works.

Isn't it time to think about this phenomenon?

Diaries L.P. Beria and, I dare say, mine

113

comments on them provide quite benign material for such benign reflections. These diaries are not a fake, but a document of the era, reflecting this era, albeit through subjective perception, but in general - objectively.

And the objective appearance of the era of Stalin and Beria is breathtakingly majestic. The poet said: "You can't see a face face to face, a big one is seen at a distance" ...

Moving away from those difficult times when, through mistakes and pain, the country gained the triumph of creation, it would seem that descendants should have seen the Great that was accomplished by their ancestors.



But far from everyone sees this Big.

Is it not because they are told from day to day that the era of Stalin is not a mighty majestic "elephant", but a dirty dung "fly".

Those who do this know why they do it. But do they know why they repeat this thoughtlessly on the Internet forums, those to whom they talk about it?

A?

This or that opinion can be balanced and true only when it is comprehensive and when it is based on knowledge of reality.

A person's opinion about the current, contemporary life can be true even without much analysis - everything happens before his eyes, in real time.

But if we need to form our own opinion about the past long ago, then we have only two ways.

You can undertake your own study of history.

This requires, among other things, a considerable

114

initial education is not necessarily historical, but necessarily significant...

Willingness and ability to analyze...

Time is needed – a lot of time, when there is no time left for anything other than analysis and study of the past.

It is also necessary to have access to large amounts of documentary information, and this requires either access to archives, or very considerable (at the level of at least hundreds or two thousand rubles) personal expenses for the acquisition of many small-circulation and expensive collections of documents, memoirs, studies and "studies" of other authors - the same Dm. Winter and etc.

In addition, of course, honesty and fearlessness of analysis are necessary, and once again - time (in the event that you intend to put the results of your research on paper and bring it to the attention of fellow citizens in one way or another).

How many of the "activists" - "anti-Stalinists" on the Internet forums can say about themselves that they have fulfilled all the above conditions before going public with their sharp attacks on Stalin, Beria and their era?

There is, however, a second way.

In order to follow it, one also needs education and self-education, one needs a certain amount of time and the ability to think, honesty and a desire to understand are definitely needed... But this path is simpler and less costly.

On this path, a person seeks to find those who walked and passed along the first, much more costly in terms of strength, means and time, path and now honestly presents the results of their research to the judgment of compatriots and contemporaries.

115

Finding such researchers today is not so difficult - if at the same time the seeker himself also worked a little. And having found them, you can and should believe them.

Not recklessly, of course, to believe, but by checking their conclusions and assessments with their own constant work of the mind and heart.

I sincerely wish all young and not so young participants of Internet forums success and achievements on one of these two paths.

At least on the second one.

Theme III

UNFUNNY "DETECTIVES" OF VENIAMIN SMEHOV

Self-Interview Experience

There is one more topic connected with Beria's diaries, but not only with them. In connection with the publication of the Diaries, I, as their publisher, was asked several times to give interviews, including on the air.

It must be said that this was not always possible, since I do not live in Moscow, but in Moscow-300, previously also known as Arzamas-75, Arzamas-16, Nizhny Novgorod-150, Kremlin and Sarov.

Initially, this place was called "the village of Sarov", and, as Arkady Gaidar reported in the story "School", the famous Sarov desert is located at a distance of sixty kilometers even from the city of Arzamas.

Sarov is even farther from Moscow, and it is more difficult to get to the metropolitan microphone or camera from there than, for example, from Tverskaya Street (former Gorky, former Tverskaya).

Sometimes interviews are canceled for other reasons as well - they simply do not risk publishing or broadcasting them.

117

Therefore, in this book, I have taken the liberty of undertaking the experience of a self-interview taken by Sergei Brezkin from Sergei Kremlev.

However, to be precise, I prepared this interview for one metropolitan publication. However, in the end, the interview "fell", so to speak, "precipitated" and did not pour into the minds and ears of fellow citizens.

Now, though belatedly, I bring it to the attention of the readers of my book.

So...

"On October 16, 2010, at 4:20 pm on NTV, the film "The Death of Beria (Dark Matter)" was shown, presented as a "historical detective story with Veniamin Smekhov", but claiming to be documentary.

The theme of Beria and his role in the history of the country is becoming more and more relevant, as evidenced by the screening of another film about Beria. One of the undoubted experts "on Beria" today is Sergey Kremlev, the author of many books on the modern and recent history of Russia, including "Beria. The best manager of the 20th century." At our request, he was interviewed by Sergei Brezkin, an old colleague of the Kremlin in his historical research.

S. Brezkin. Sergey, how would you, who wrote a lot about Beria, including his death, rate this film as a whole?

S. Kremlev. In general, I can say that in our time to shoot a film of this content and level on an acute historical topic is about the same as making a film in the 21st century about the fact that the Earth is flat and stands on three elephants.

S. Brezkun. What is it?

S. Kremlev. I say this so confidently because, claiming to be documentary, although

And

118

with the inclusion of game elements in it, the film is simply full of factual inaccuracies.

For example, G.M. Malenkov is presented as a formal head of state after the death of I.V. Stalin, although the formal head was the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR K.E. Voroshilov, as before him - Shvernik, as before Shvernik - Kalinin...

Sergei Goglidze, who was arrested in the "Beria case", turns out to be the head of counterintelligence of the Soviet Army, and he was the head of the 3rd Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. Yes, this department was in charge of counterintelligence in the SA and the Navy, but it was not an army structure, but a structure of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

The film speaks of a "session of the Central Committee", although it is necessary to talk about the Plenum of the Central Committee...

Young Beria leaves in the film to study in Baku at the Polytechnic Institute, although he graduated from the Architecture and Construction School.

KB-1, which was led by Pavel Kuksenko and Sergo Beria, was called "rocket building", and this head design bureau for the development of Moscow air defense was complex and was more engaged in work on detection and interception systems.

And so on...

S. Brezkun. Well, all this can be regarded as annoying, but minor inaccuracies! Is not it?

S. Kremlev. It is possible, of course, but, firstly, the competence and qualifications of a researcher are made up of trifles. Secondly, there are more serious overexposures in the film. So, in passing, the tale about the contacts of the NKVD of Beria with the Gestapo before the war is again launched into circulation. It is stated that Beria was officially accused of mass rapes, although he, according to prosecutor Andrei

119

Sukhomlinov, the only researcher admitted to the investigative case of L.P. Beria, only one, and even that doubtful, charge of raping a certain Valya Drozdova was brought.

It is alleged that the film actress Zoya Fedorova was immediately sent to the camp, allegedly after she rejected Beria's harassment. But such a statement must be documented and irrefutably proved, otherwise it is difficult to regard it otherwise than as slanderous.

Actor Veniamin Smekhov, the lead of the film, claims that the "bloody" Commissar Beria allegedly sent hundreds of thousands of innocent people to their deaths. But mass repressions on the scale of the USSR were carried out under Beria's predecessor, People's Commissar Yezhov. Beria at that moment was the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party (b) of Georgia and, as the head of the republican "troika", could pass "execution" sentences only within the Georgian SSR.

At the same time, there was a strong anti-Soviet underground with Menshevik roots in Georgia; in Georgia intertwined, as now, the interests of many anti-Russian forces of the United States and Europe, which had in Georgia

numerous agents.

In addition, in Georgia there was a strong criminal banditry, and not less than 10% and up to 15% of extrajudicial "execution" sentences in 1937-1938 in the USSR concerned just criminals (which today they prefer to keep quiet).

In total, Beria approved no more than 2 thousand sentences in the first category in Georgia. Once at the head of the NKVD of the USSR from the end of November 1938, Beria initiated a return process - at least 200 thousand convicts in 1937-1938 were quickly released.

120

In 1939, Beria introduced into the structure of the NKVD such an amazing unit as the Bureau for Receiving and Considering Complaints!

The total number of "execution" sentences approved by Beria as the head of the Special Meeting in the NKVD of the USSR in the period from 1939 to the end of 1945 is also no more than a few thousand (including the years of the war), therefore, no hundreds of thousands "innocent" deaths are out of the question! This is not my opinion, but a reliable historical fact!

S. Brezkun. But there are Beria's signatures on the "execution" and "torture" "papers"?!

S. Kremlev. Oh, the signatures shown in the film require a separate discussion! Without the possibility of a detailed explanation, I will simply note that the same – as far as I understand, fake – captions in the film are shown either as falsified, or as seemingly genuine. If you know where they come from; You can only shrug your shoulders, looking at the screen.

As the poet said: "All this would be funny if it were not so sad"...

S. Brezkun. And this is all the flaws of the film?

S. Kremlev. Alas, no, not all! For example, the film claims that Beria allegedly did not allow doctors to see the sick Stalin, stating that you, they say, are climbing to Comrade Stalin, don't you see that he is sleeping? But usually these, alas, also, no doubt, stories are attributed to the situation not with doctors, but with Stalin's guards! For some reason, they allegedly summoned Beria to a nearby dacha, who since 1946 had nothing to do with Stalin's protection.

It was the Minister of GB Ig who was obliged to call the security

121

Natiev (he is also the head of the security department of the MGB) or/and the de facto head of the security department of the MGB Ryzasny.

The ridiculous statement about the alleged appearance of Beria in Buenos Aires and so on looks very undignified.

Only regret can cause the involvement of Antonov-Ovseenko in the creation of the film. Even the elder brother of Antonov-Ovseenko Jr. denied him the right to competent historical judgments - Antonov-Ovseyenko Jr. himself wrote about this.

But this is so, by the way.

S. Brezkun. And what about one of the main statements of the film that Beria was not shot on December 23, 1953, but was killed during the storming of his mansion on June 26, 1953?

S. Kremlev. Yes, this is interesting! On the one hand, such a statement well illustrates the level of the filmmakers. Then they deprive Lavrenty Pavlovich of his life already on June 26, 1953,

then they prolong his life so much that he gets the opportunity to walk "in white pants" around the capitals of South America, which the unforgettable Ostap Bender so dreamed of.

Listening to all this, you involuntarily remember: "Ostap was carried" ...

However, even such serious analysts as Yuri Mukhin, Ivan Chigirin and others, including Elena Prudnikova, who gives an interview in the film, unfortunately believe that Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria was shot on June 26, 1953, under the notorious mythical "storm" of his mansion.

I have written in my books why this version cannot be accepted. Testify against her

122

and clearly written by Beria, his "letters from the bunker" dated July 1 and 2, 1953, and a photo of Beria after his arrest, and a number of other details.

But first of all, we must take into account the reliable fact that Beria was on June 26, 1953 in the Kremlin, in his Cabinet of Ministers. The fact is that on that day Beria managed to work with at least two documents.

First, he signed the Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR corrected by him "On the tasks and test program at the test site No. 2 (Semipalatinsk. — S.B.) in 1953." This, one of the last documents worked out by him, was not issued with the assignment of the corresponding number and did not go into action. On June 26, 1953, Beria was arrested, and on July 11, 1953, Malenkov signed a new Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR No. 1761-686ss under the same name.

On June 26, 1953, on the day of his arrest, L.P. Beria also signed his last officially registered state document in the Kremlin — Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR No. 8532rs on the approval of the project assignment for the construction of the SU-3 plant of Combine No. , as well as cultural and community construction with a volume of 7.3 thousand m<sup>3</sup> with a total estimated cost of 406 million rubles. in prices introduced from July 1, 1950.

By the way, it is indicative that the tasks of industrial reconstruction and social development of the enterprise were set on the same level. This was typical both for the entire post-war era of Stalin, when the social development of the USSR was increasingly put at the forefront, and for the style specifically of L.P. Beria.

123

Then Lavrenty Pavlovich went to that meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee, which was the last one for him and at which a decision was made - obviously, by the way, with the participation of Beria - to form a new "atomic » Ministry of Medium Machine Building of the USSR.

Two documents signed personally by him convincingly prove the presence of L.P. Beria on the afternoon of June 26, 1953 in the Kremlin, and not in his mansion.

S. Brezkun. Sometimes they refer to the words of Lazar Kaganovich, who, in his speech at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, held in early July 1953 immediately after the overthrow of Beria, said: "The Central Committee destroyed the adventurer Beria ..."

Is it possible to regard these words as a careless, reckless admission that by the time the Plenum began, Beria was no longer among the living?

S. Kremlev. If someone quotes something, then it is necessary to quote correctly. And Kaganovich then said this: "We held out to the end, and then in one fell swoop we slammed this scoundrel

forever... But, comrades, of course, expelling and arresting (emphasis in bold italics mine. — S.K.) is not enough.."

Only then, after a couple of phrases, Kaganovich uttered the famous: "The Central Committee destroyed the adventurer Beria ..."

That is, in fact, we are looking for one more proof of Beria's arrest in the Kremlin from Kaganovich. As for the words about "the destruction of the adventurer Beria by the Central Committee," they must be understood as a political assessment of what happened. The very fact that the merit of "destruction" is attributed to the Central Committee proves precisely

124

the political, not the literal meaning of the word "destroyed".

But more than that! In the same transcript of the same July 1953 Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, in the speech of Molotov, we find direct confirmation that Beria was arrested in the Kremlin during the meeting of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

Molotov then reported:

"..When on June 26 the entire Presidium sat and accused Beria for two and a half hours of all his sins (and there are many of them), we asked him to explain what other fundamental issues he had in mind to solve when deciding the question of the signature of the Secretary of the Central Committee under the protocols of the Presidium.

To this he replies: maybe we need to draw up an agenda. So is this the real issue? He lied like the last rogue, could not answer anything ... "

I think everything should be clear here.

Beria was arrested in the Kremlin.

There is also, say, a record of the interrogation of Beria by the new - Khrushchev - Prosecutor General of the USSR Rudenko dated July 7, 1953. He is quoted in his book about Beria on p. 410 - 414 Prosecutor Andrey Sukhomlinov.

This interrogation concerned the activities of L.P. Beria in 1919-1920 in Baku, including in the counterintelligence of the Musavat regime. Beria's answers contain such details concerning that period that only the real Beria could know and only the real Beria could describe.

S. Brezkun. But maybe the protocol is made up?

S. Kremlev. It is impossible for an outsider to invent such a protocol! And the interrogation protocol  
from

125

On July 7, 1953, it was probably not invented and signed by the living, real Lavrenty Pavlovich.

Another thing is that this is most likely one of the few authentic protocols of interrogations of Beria, which are in his 37-volume, basically, apparently, falsified, investigative case.

I think L.P. Beria was shot without trial no later than in the middle or at the end of August 1953, after the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of June 26, 1953 on the deprivation of L.P. Beria of all his positions, titles and awards.

After that, the reprisal against Beria became not only legally safe for its organizers, but also turned out to be necessary - as an effective means of influencing the arrested associates of Beria - Dekanozov, Kobulov, Goglidze, Meshik, Vlodzimirsky and later arrested Merkulov.

That is, only one thesis of the film "The Death of Beria" is historically consistent - about his execution not on December 23, 1953, along with six of his other associates, but much earlier and without trial.

But not when it's in the movie.

S. Brezkun. And what about the story of Beria's son himself about the storming of the mansion on June 26 and about his father, who was killed on the same day?

S. Kremlev. With all due respect to the memory of Sergo Beria, who, as far as I know, lived his life quite worthily, I cannot but say this ...

This story, as well as a number of clearly fictional facts cited by Sergo Lavrentievich in his book about his father, let it remain on the conscience of the narrator.

Perhaps in a muddy perestroika and postpere

126

Sergo Beria and some of them, together with him, succumbed to the desire to give out a "fried sensation" in the construction atmosphere. By the way, in this regard, little is changed by the similar testimony of Beria's former subordinate in the USSR Council of Ministers, People's Commissar (Minister) of the USSR Oil Industry Baibakov, a figure, in my opinion, historically far from flawless.

Yes, Beria, whom Baibakov generously poured mud on at the July 1953 Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU, was, apparently, extrajudicially killed not on December 23, 1953, but much earlier. But he was not killed during the storming of the mansion!

Think for yourself! If on an ordinary Friday day in the center of Stalin's, full of stability and order, Moscow, and even near Beria's mansion, there was a shootout, there would be an accumulation of military vehicles, etc., then no later than in the evening no one would gossip about it only in Odessa Privoz, but also in Vladivostok!

Not to mention Tel Aviv and New York...

However, nothing like that then, in real time, was not even close.

S. Brezkun. Well, the last question: how do you feel about Beria?

S. Kremlev. I have written a long book about him, but I can say briefly. I am convinced that if, after the death of Stalin, the country had been headed by the socialist technocrat Beria, and not by the petty-bourgeois party crat Khrushchev, then today we would have a free, powerful and abundant Soviet Union with a developed socialist democracy based on the primacy not of the party, but of the Soviet Union. power elected in alternative elections.

It is unlikely that Beria's USSR would have been the richest country

127

noah of the world. After all, Russia has never "milked" foreign peoples - unlike the Yankees, the British, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Danes, the Swedes, the Spaniards, the Japanese ... "Milked", rather, us!

Not to mention the fact that of all the great powers of the world, only Russia has more than once paid with the blood of her sons and daughters not only for her own freedom, but also for the freedom and independence of other peoples.

I repeat, the post-Stalin Beria USSR would hardly have been the richest country in the world precisely because it would have been the most honest and just country in the world. But the post-Stalin Beria USSR, powerful and abundant, would have been the most morally and intellectually healthy country in the world.

And everything healthy in the world would be drawn to us!

I believe that if we correctly — that is, exactly like this — look at our past, then there is a chance that a joyful and happy future is still possible for us.”

ka

I almost gave such an interview once to the Moscow press, although I am always ready, if not to come to Moscow, then at least to answer any questions by phone (after all, it happened like that).

Alas, today's sowers of the “unreasonable, unkind and short-lived” do not need either honest answers or historical truth.

However, I will return to this feature of our time, considering the eighth topic, where I will touch on the antisocial activities of professional falsifiers of history.

GU theme

THERE IS NOTHING TO RESPOND TO BERIA, IF KATYN IS IN A LIE

Perhaps the reader has already forgotten, but the author promised to quote the final paragraph of Professor Kozlov's article separately in order to comment on it at the end of the book.

However, often the plans and intentions of the author in the course of the work undergo certain changes. And now I have decided that it is necessary to acquaint the reader with extracts from the final paragraph of Professor Kozlov's article already when considering the fourth topic. This topic can be defined as a kind of paraphrase of the Russian proverb “There is nothing to blame on the mirror if the face is crooked”, but in this case the mirror is crooked ...

And this is where we need to stop...

Anton Pavlovich Chekhov has a Christmas story “Crooked Mirror”, the plot of which is as follows. One woman accidentally looked into such a distorted mirror and saw that it transformed her beyond recognition, turning the ugly girl into an indescribable beauty. And now she sits in front of the mirror and cannot stop admiring herself. And next to her, at the same time with her, sits her husband, spellbound

129

wondrous beauty (albeit visible only in a crooked mirror) of his wife.

Chekhov's mind was not only invariably sharp, but sometimes paradoxical. Therefore, our great writer was able to look at the normative meaning of the expression “as in a distorted mirror” from an unexpected point of view. A crooked mirror that shows negative reality not in its true, that is, negative, but in a distorted, non-realistic, positive sense, is indeed a fresh and interesting idea.

I don't know if modern masters of psychological warfare have read Chekhov, but they adopted the idea expressed in his Christmas story long ago.

Showing the truth in a distorted mirror is not new, although it is also used in Rossiyanie, as they say, to its fullest. But to show falsehood in a distorted mirror is already more cunning and inventive!



However, today, to show the broad masses of the era of Stalin and Beria, the regime and the historians and "intellectuals" serving it use both types of crooked mirrors.

In one case, a traditional distorted mirror is shoved into the people, and the great era looks ugly, petty, insignificant, and its creators look like tyrants and executioners.

In another case, a "Chekhovian" distorting mirror is used, and the real ugly phenomena of the era, for example, anti-Soviet terror and sabotage, are transformed into alleged inventions of the OGPU, and sinister figures such as Trotsky, Bukharin or Tukhachevsky into "heroes".

At the same time, leading people to both types of curves

130

mirrors, Yeltsinoid "guides" cover themselves with academic togas. So Professor Kozlov, at the end of his allegedly revealing article, writes as follows:

"The task of this review does not include an assessment of the most difficult period in our history associated with the name of Stalin. There is no event or phenomenon, it is not only methodology or ideology, but also such universal concepts as morality and morality.

Well, when today's "general people" begin to talk about "morality and morality", you need to keep your ears open! Especially when this is what follows:

"The last two concepts (that is, morality and morality. - S.K.) are related not only to the era of Stalin, but also to our time ..."

So something like that, but not exactly like that.

And even, perhaps, not at all.

I do not consider myself a "general person", but I am convinced that the concepts of "morality" and "morality" are related not only to the era of Stalin and Beria and not only to the deeds of Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Putin with Medvedev and Medvedev with Putin ...

Such concepts are relevant to any society worthy of being called human, or at least not rejecting humanism, that is, humanity (from the Latin Pitapiz - "human") as a principle.

At the same time, the essence of the concepts of "morality" and "morality" has not actually changed for honest and

131

human beings from Homeric times to the present day.

Another thing is that from the standpoint of a humanistic understanding of morality and morality, one or another era (like, for example, the current Yeltsinoid era) should be characterized as immoral and immoral.

I will say more about this later.

Professor Kozlov for some reason separates the methodology of scientific research and ideology from morality and ethics, but these last two concepts are inseparable from both scientific methodology and ideology.

Lenin had already correctly noted that from now on there are only two types of ideology—bourgeois and socialist.

So, if a member of society (or, if we take it already, a historian) professes the morality of a purebred and personal well-being at any cost, if he neglects the norms of morality that do not allow him to prosper at the expense of his robbed or deceived neighbors, then such a historian will use to "substantiate" their false "truths" a well-defined methodology...

Namely, the methodology of manipulating public mass consciousness.

And this "methodology" will serve a well-defined ideology - bourgeois, private property. And here I am not doing political literacy in the style of the Central Committee of the CPSU, but I am telling the truth.

The truth, comrades!

Already Moses ben Maimonides understood that if someone has property without working, it means that someone works without property.

Cervantes already knew that people would eventually

132

divided into the haves and the have-nots. I will only emphasize that this division takes place in exploitative, that is, ultimately based on theft, societies.

In fact, Proudhon said so: "Property is theft." And he spoke even before Marx.

And even before Marx, the cunning fox Talleyrand admitted to his friends that there are only those who cut their hair and those who are cut, and one must always try to be on the side of the former against the latter.

Talleyrand did just that. He was very fond of what he called "sweet". People more honestly call it, however, bribes.

I wonder if Professor Kozlov and his like-minded people have a sweet tooth, like Talleyrand? They repeat like a spell that their task is not to evaluate the most difficult period of our history associated with the name of Stalin, but in fact they lie and slander the era of Stalin, Stalin himself and Stalin's associates ...

And among the latter - first of all to Beria.

Why did it happen?

Professor Kozlov writes:

"The scale and effectiveness of Beria's activities cannot but inspire respect, if only we are able to forget their price ..."

Well, let's break this idea into two parts.

Judging by the first part of the phrase, Professor Kozlov understands the scope and recognizes the effectiveness of Beria's activities, and they inspire respect in him.

However, why not?

What was Beria's activity aimed at?

In Azerbaijan, young Beria was engaged in oral

133

roystvo life of workers, and then fought in the AzChK against the enemies of the workers' revolution.

In Georgia, he established law and tranquility as a Chekist, also working in the name of the people, and from the beginning of the 30s, in a matter of years, he literally transformed Georgia, making it the most powerful and dynamically developing national republic of the USSR.

Having moved to Moscow, Beria made, without exaggeration, a historical contribution to the reorganization of the border troops, to the organization of a military rebuff to the Nazi invasion, to the leadership of the defense industry, to the post-war economic recovery of the country, and then to the elimination of the US atomic monopoly and the creation of a nuclear shield. - that Russia ...

What about the price?

The price was for an era in which there were many enemies of labor Russia, and for deeds that were hindered by many sinister forces both outside the country and inside it ...

And now, instead of objectively, balanced and comprehensively understanding all this, as Professor Kozlov himself admits, the most difficult period of our history, dirty labels are constantly hung on this period. And allegedly put up "price tags", where the true historical price of the creative phenomena of the era is many times underestimated, and the true historical price of its negative phenomena is many times overstated.

How does all this relate to those "morality" and "ethics" that Professor Kozlov cares about so much?

And are he and his colleagues at the Russian Academy of Sciences able to give an objective, statistically substantiated answer to the question: "What kind of material and human

134

Have the peoples of the USSR already paid the price for the social bacchanalia of the last twenty anti-Soviet years of their history?"

After all, the material price was the loss of advanced scientific and technical positions, a rollback from 20% of world production to 4%, the export of capital for at least a trillion dollars (and possibly even 7 trillion dollars)...

As for the human price, then, taking into account the unborn and prematurely deceased, this price has long ago exceeded 10 million lives and is moving towards 20 million. That's how much Hitler cost Russia.

Fans of the "green" "cabbage" grown in the "garden" of the US Federal Reserve System prefer to keep quiet about all this different kind - they don't talk about the rope in the hanged man's house.

But Professor and Corresponding Member Kozlov once again allows himself to speak for me and exclaims:

"In any case, this price does not exist for the Kremlin: just think, it exclaims 18 thousand executed in 1937-1938. in Georgia - only four shot per thousand inhabitants (vol. 1, p. 36). However, even here disputes are possible. It is only important that they be honest with all participants and without false evidence like Beria's "Personal Diary."

So, Professor Kozlov is trying to present Kremlev, that is, me, as a kind of soulless cynic, almost "henchmen of the executioner Beria" ...

Well, I'll have to quote here the entire page 36 of volume 1 of Beria's diaries (the beginning of the autoquote is the last paragraph on p. 35, the end of the autoquote is on p. 37).

135

Let me remind you that the text below does not refer to my comments on L.P. Beria, but taken from a short introductory essay "Beria: the path from the Caucasus to Moscow":

"... As for the "bloody repressions", by the end of the KGB operation of 1937-1938, about one out of 277 residents of Georgia was imprisoned in various prisons and camps of the NKVD. For comparison, let me remind you that about one out of 150 "dear Russians" is "sitting" in the current "Rossiania", that is, in Georgia during the time of Beria, the number of prisoners per 1,000 people was approximately two times less than in the Yeltsinoid "Rossiania" in the current "democratic" times.

Even according to very suspicious estimates of the end of 1953, eight thousand people were sentenced to capital punishment in Georgia in 1937-1938. Is this a lot or a little for turbulent times, when a sharp social struggle between the new and the old turned out to be a real feature of life, and vice versa?

Now the "accountants" of the unfortunate reformer Saakadze are increasing the number of those repressed in Georgia in the 1st category (that is, those sentenced to capital punishment) to 15,000 people (and not 18,000, as in Professor Kozlov, who allegedly quotes the Kremlin. — S. K.), which is even more doubtful. But if we accept such a reliable figure - what then? With a population of Georgia of 3.5 million people, this gives four shots per thousand inhabitants. Is it a lot or a little?

Back in 1920, Georgia was Menshevik. In fact, the government party of the Mensheviks then numbered up to 80,000 members, of which at least 10% were active, including functionaries...

Anti-Soviet and anti-Russian sentiments were encouraged and fed not only by the Mensheviks, but also by their Western patrons. In Georgia... the Americans with the British, the French with the Turks, and even the Poles (the latter, by the way, very actively) planted their agents actively. The Georgian proletariat was still weak, but

136

Lavelika stratum of merchants, nobles, various kinds of princes, merchants, semi-criminal lumpen  
and so on.

So the question is: what, in the late 1930s, in a Georgian town with a population of, say, five thousand, there were not two dozen active enemies of Soviet power?

Yes, there were more! Apart from the traditional for the Caucasus corrupt officials.

... Beria ... took repressive measures in such a way as to minimize them as much as possible. Nevertheless, his repressive policy turned out to be very effective in the sense that the Germans did not have an active "fifth column" in Georgia even during their greatest success in the Caucasus.

A possible German occupation of Georgia would take at least 50-60 thousand lives of Georgians alone (not to mention Georgian Jews). That is... the objective "arithmetic" of repressions in Georgia does not blame, but justifies Beria...

It was impossible to do without blood at all, because the presence of a powerful "fifth column" on the eve of a possible big war would lead to much more blood in the event of a war ... "

Well, where is the apology for political cynicism or bloodthirstiness here? ..

On the other hand, is the image of Beria from the time of repressions, which was and is being imposed on us, really true?

Take, for example, a certain Mark Ashkenazy, an innocent victim of 1937. I used the word "innocent" without irony, since Ashkenazi was, after all, officially found not guilty. But it seems to me very much that this Mark was not so without guilt - Trotskyism from him is clearly smelled.

In 1991, the Volgo-Vyatka publishing house in Nizhny Novgorod published the book by Mark Ashkenazy "And it was in those days: Essays. Memories".

A native of Bobruisk, later Nizhny Novgorod

137

Mark Ashkenazy (1887-1981) was a journalistic journalist who in the 1930s worked as editor-in-chief of the evening newspaper Gorky Rabochiy. In May 1938, he was arrested, kept in pre-trial detention in Gorky, and on January 8, 1940, at the visiting court session of the Military Tribunal of the Moscow Military District, he was acquitted by the court.

In 1962 he wrote a memoir, published in 1991. For the topic of this book, it is interesting and useful what Ashkenazi's book says about Beria, how his appearance is presented and how much it corresponds to historical truth from the factual and chronological points of view.

The first time the name of Beria is mentioned already in the preface of 1991, where the son of Mark Ashkenazy, I. Ashkenazy, writes:

"... For more than a year we did not know where my father was, whether he was alive.

Then it turned out that he was in the internal prison on Vorobyovka, under investigation.

But Yezhov is being removed. Now the famous Georgian Marxist Beria will restore order. And ... indeed, there is a rumor that the entire group of arrested Gorky Party and Soviet workers will be tried by a military tribunal. Not a "troika", not a "special meeting", but a real court.

And here comes January 8, 1940."

So, Ashkenazi (from his memoirs he looks, I repeat, quite a typical hidden Trots-Kist and oppositionist) was imprisoned by Yezhov, and gained freedom due to the fact that the "famous Georgian Marxist Beria" became the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs of the USSR and really "put things in order".

It was Beria who set in motion a mass revision

138

investigation cases and sentences, resulting in the release of hundreds of thousands of people. Mark Ashkenazy himself reports that in 1939 his new cellmates, former chiefs of the NKVD district departments, told him that "... enemies of the people "are now being released in batches" and assured that "I (Mark Ashkenazy. - S.K.) will be released soon. Nevertheless, Ashkenazi certifies them as follows: "...poorly literate, not yet completely spoiled by the Yezhov-Beria school ..."

Well, everything is clear about Yezhov - Ashkenazy has nothing to love him for.

But why such anger towards Beria?

It must be said that Ashkenazi describes the consequences and conditions of imprisonment, often admitting obvious lies and exaggerating his personal suffering - let's not forget that the "unfortunate victim of the regime" is well

Luckily lived to be 94 (ninety-four) years old, having died in 1981. At the same time, Ashkenazi is sometimes false where the falsification of history is detected with the naked eye, as they say.

Here is a specific example of this.

Ashkenazi was arrested in May 1938, as described on p. 89 - 90 of his book. Then the story is consistently brought up to August 1938, when Ashkenazi is brought for another interrogation to the head of the department and he allegedly notices that "...the portrait of Yezhov, the favorite of all the people, was no longer on the wall..."

Well, this could not have happened in August 1938 - only at the end of August of that year, Beria was transferred to Moscow, and to the post of Yezhov's first deputy, becoming People's Commissar only in November 1938.

However, against the background of our last twenty

139

false years, the lies of Ashkenazi are a trifle, of course. They lied about Beria and more abruptly ...

And the coolest lie, in a sense, is "Katyn". No wonder it was the "Katyn" modern "grave-diggers" and "whistle-blowers" near Smolensk that suffered the heavenly—in any sense—punishment.

The "Katyn" fake was convincingly exposed already in real time as a result of the work of the Special Commission to establish and investigate the circumstances of the execution by the Nazi invaders in the Katyn forest of Polish officers of war. On January 24, 1944, this commission, under the leadership of Academician Burdenko, published a message putting everything in its place.

However, Professor Kozlov keeps quiet about all this and writes:

"Symbolically, however, the absence in Beria's Personal Diary of an entry about the meeting of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks on March 5, 1940, at which a decision was made on extrajudicial reprisals against captured Polish officers. In Stalin's Journals, this meeting with the presence of Beria is recorded. It is clear that there is no record of this most important event in Beria's Personal Diary: its publisher seems to call all documents about this fake. Azatem even makes Beria in his diary resent Hitler's political and ideological provocation. It seems, - Beria allegedly writes in his "Personal Diary" about the discovery of the corpses of executed Poles in Katyn, - these are the Poles who fled from us when leaving Smolensk, They had to go to the rear on their own, and they remained with the Germans. Well, they got theirs. This public has always declared that it is better to be dead than red" (vol. 2, p. 111)."

140

If, as Professor Kozlov suspects me, I had the intention of "forcing" L.P. Beria "to be indignant at Hitler's political and ideological "provocation"" in order to strengthen the official Soviet version, then such indignation could be framed even more subtly. The trouble is that Beria expressed his feelings and thoughts without consulting the Kremlin, and at the same time wrote the holy truth - the bulk of the Polish officers were anti-Soviet by conviction.

Answering Professor Kozlov, I have already written about the "Katyn" aspect of the problem, and now I will expand its consideration somewhat. Only a few, and not on a full scale - solely because this book is still not dedicated to Katyn. In addition, the "Katyn" theme has been considered – in detail and objectively – more than once and by many.

Professor Kozlov, citing my words that the Polish prisoners of war were shot not by the NKVD officers in 1940 by decision of the Politburo, but by the Germans in 1941 in order to provide themselves with

an opportune moment, a strong propagandistic leverage to complicate Soviet-Polish relations and discredit the Soviet Union in the outside world, further exclaims:

"An old song that makes no sense to comment after numerous documentary publications on this issue."

But what documentary publications is he referring to? There are now quite a few documentary publications on the "Katyn" issue, however, all documentary, and not supposedly documentary, publications

141

The locations unequivocally fix the "German" and only the "German" trace in Katyn.

In particular, Professor Kozlov cannot be unaware of the materials of that "round table" on Katyn, which was held on April 19, 2010 in the State Duma under the chairmanship of the Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Law, Professor Viktor Ivanovich Ilyukhin - now deceased.

The well-known Russian historian, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Vladimir Petrovich Kozlov was not among the participants of the round table. However, among them were, for example, Yuri Nikolayevich Zhukov, a leading researcher at the Institute of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vyacheslav Petrovich Zimonin, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Valentin Aleksandrovich Sakharov, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor of Lomonosov Moscow State University. M.V. Lomonosov, Victor Mikhailovich Kruk - Major General of Justice, Sergey Ivanovich Gabovsky, Colonel of Justice, employee of the Chief Military Prosecutor's Office in 1989-1997, and a number of other quite professionally competent and civilly responsible public figures, including famous and brilliant researchers of the "Katyn" theme writers Yuri Mukhin and Vladislav Shved.

The materials of the "round table" were published in 2010 in quite a mass circulation as an appendix to the journal "Political Self-Education" under the title "Secrets of the Katyn tragedy". There were also given examples of the technology for falsifying Beria's signature during the "perestroika" production of "Katyn" fakes.

Trying to "open" the technology of the alleged forgery of Sergei Kremliev, the most venerable Professor Vla

142

Dimir Petrovich Kozlov, a well-known debunker of falsifications and fakes, did not prove anything.

And I once again invite him to join in exposing the obvious "Katyn" lies - here his chances of success are not only high, but, no doubt, absolute.

But will the semi-official professor Kozlov do this?

After all, the public, at the highest state level, "recognition" of the allegedly Soviet "guilt" for Katyn was at first one of the powerful factors in the destruction of the USSR and the camp of socialism, and today it greatly discredits Russia.

On the contrary, a public, at the highest state level, recognition of the leaders of the Russian Federation that the "Katyn" documents presented by them earlier is Gorbachev's "perestroika" fake, although it will undermine the authority of the Russian leadership, it will unequivocally and powerfully raise and strengthen the authority Russia itself as a state and society.

Is this necessary for today's semi-official historians and their customers?

Of course not.

Therefore, there is nothing to blame on Beria, if ...

Well, I think, and so everything, perhaps, is clear.

Theme U

"QUIET DON" by MIKHAIL SHOLOHOV AND "DIARIES" OF BERIA

In 1984, the publishing houses "Soit Eogiae A.5. 0510 "and" Nitash#g. RGAÿ: meme ÿegÿeu "was released in the light of the book" Tÿ -Aÿ -POG ÿ ÿ Tÿe © and Steiner Gil.

The origin of this book is as follows.

In the autumn of 1974, in Paris, with a foreword by Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a certain "scientific" "research" was published, the author of which was identified by the then deceased Soviet literary critic, whose name was masked by the pseudonym "D\*".

And the author of the "study"; and the author of the preface unanimously asserted that most of the famous novel by Mikhail Sholokhov "The Quiet Flows the Don" was written not by Sholokhov, but by the "Cossack" White Guard writer Fyodor Kryukov.

And she went and went to write "province" ..

External and internal "fighters" for "democracy" and "human rights" began to glorify Sholokhov

"pla

144

giator". And, accordingly, to accuse him of "fraud". Roy Medvedev, a well-known truth teller at that time, put forward a "version" that Sholokhov could probably impose his own style on Kryukov's notes and diaries.

Oddly enough, the honor of the great Russian Soviet writer was seriously defended not in his homeland, but on the Scandinavian Peninsula. Already in 1975, the linguist Sven Gustavson from Stockholm began work on the topic "Who wrote The Quiet Flows the Don?", using new methods of computer analysis of texts to solve this issue.

In the autumn of the same year, a Swedish-Norwegian group was created, consisting of: Sven Gustavson, Bengt Beckman (Stockholm); Geir Hyotso and Steinar Gil (Oslo). It was an experienced and serious "team". For example, Professor Hyotso by that time was known as the author of major monographs on Baratynsky and Dostoevsky, wrote a number of articles on the work of Sholokhov, whom he met personally. There was no doubt about the objectivity and qualifications of such a "team".

For analysis, excerpts from texts undeniably belonging to Sholokhov (about 50,000 words) and undeniably belonging to Kryukov (about 50,000 words) were selected and prepared for research.

Kryukov's texts were taken from his pre-revolutionary works "Cossack Motifs" (block I), as well as "Stories" and "Step on the Spot" (block P).

Sholokhov's texts were selected from "Don Stories" (block I) and "Virgin Soil Uplifted" (block P).

These texts were compared with the texts of three editions of The Quiet Don (TD - 1, 2, 4).

In order for the reader to better understand

145



the scale and complexity of the study, I will inform you that after entering on machine media, the following data were obtained:

Kryukov (block!)

Number of sentences 1781 Number of words used 24 913 Number of different word forms 9470

Kryukov (block 1).

Number of sentences 1955 Number of words used 24 352 Number of different word forms 9940

Sholokhov (block I)

Number of sentences 2825 Number of words used 32 957 Number of different word forms 12 380 Sholokhov (block 1).

Number of sentences 1385 Number of words used 18 673 Number of different word forms 8273 TD-1

Number of sentences 1177 Number of words used 12 720 Number of different word forms 6248 TD-2

Number of sentences 1168 Number of words used 15 179 Number of different word forms 7 424 TD-4

Number of sentences 1415 Number of words used 20 195 Number of different word forms 9291

Computer processing was carried out at the Center for Computational Linguistics, Uppsala University. The length of sentences and words, the vocabulary of texts, the coefficient of typical signs, the richness of vocabulary,

146

correlation of lexemes and word forms, classes of words, compatibility of words, etc.

In statistical processing, etc. In addition to the main group, a number of other researchers participated, and the work was basically completed five years after it began.

I cannot say for sure, but I doubt that Professor Kozlov spent at least five days analyzing the Diaries.

I do not pretend to special attention to myself - Kremlev is not Sholokhov. But Beria, excuse me, is not Kryukov either. So to judge the authenticity or falsity of his diaries, as they say, with kondach-ka is not very solid.

What conclusions did the Swedish-Norwegian group come to?

Well, more about that later, but first I'll tell you that in 1989 their study was translated into Russian and published by the Moscow publishing house "Kniga" under the title "Who Wrote The Quiet Flows the Don?".

Although the theme of the book was no less fascinating than a twisted detective story, this book is far from a detective story, both in content and in form. It contains a lot of statistical tables, formulas, and other similar things that are typical for a serious, albeit small in volume, scientific monograph.

Below I will give a few such quotations from the book, which are quite accessible to mass unprofessional perception.

Thus, Sven Gustavson, Bengt Beckmann, Geir Hjøtso and Steinar Gil wrote:

147

"... In the case of *The Quiet Flows the Don*, we have one "recognized" author (Sholokhov) and one "pretender" (Kryukov) ...

The method that we use in this case is similar to that used in forensic medical practice to establish paternity. Based on the blood gene analysis, the court can rule out the possibility of paternity for a given person with a 90 percent probability. If such a possibility cannot be excluded, then the court usually recognizes paternity of the one who is called the father of the child, except in cases where there is irrefutable evidence of his innocence, such as, for example, the gestational age

or impotence..."

If we move from *The Quiet Flows the Don* to *The Diaries of Beria*, then we can say that in this case we have only one "father" - Beria, whose "paternity" in relation to the Diaries is questioned by Professor Kozlov.

But at the same time, Professor Kozlov did not prove that the possibility of Beria's "paternity" was ruled out not only with a 90% probability, but did not prove anything at all. Professor Kozlov did not provide any concrete evidence at all to support his assertion.

But here he claims that the author of the Diaries is not Beria, but Kremlev.

N-yes...

As follows from the above quotation, in the case of a medical examination, even a 10% probability of the possibility of "paternity" is interpreted in favor of paternity. And the court recognizes paternity for the one who is called the father of the child. L.P. himself is called the "father" of Beria's Diaries. Beria. But Professor Kozlov, contrary to logic (and any investigation, ideally,

148

is guided by it), categorically does not allow the possibility of such "paternity".

But in order to have at least some grounds for such a denial, it would not hurt to conduct a more serious analysis than the very superficial and superficial analysis of the text of the Diaries, which was supposedly carried out by Professor Kozlov. From the point of view of chronology, he did not find any discrepancies, from the point of view of historical facts and the facts of the Diaries, too.

What remains is a purely stylistic and textual analysis. But even here it is not so simple. Here is what Swedish-Norwegian researchers write in their book:

"... analysis of the text cannot confirm with certainty that the work was written by one or another author. Even if, in terms of language and style, a disputed work shows a clear resemblance to works that can be attributed with full confidence to a given author, there is always a possibility, at least theoretically, that this work was written by another author, whose works have the same linguistic and stylistic features. "

I draw the reader's attention to how accurately genuine scientists prefer to express themselves. There is no categorical approach - only assumptions, versions and hypotheses that researchers undertake to prove with varying degrees of probability, but - obviously not with 100 percent!

Linguists from Scandinavia further explained:

"... in our case, the hypothesis put forward should be checked in order to exclude the possibility of authorship. If the "blood samples" taken from the works of Kryukov and from The Quiet Don differ greatly from each other, then it is possible with a high degree of probability to remove from Kru

149

kova any suspicion of authorship. Thus, the method of exclusion should be considered as the main principle for determining authorship in disputable cases. The solution to this problem must be approached, remembering the aphorism of Sherlock Holmes that the truth can be found only by

exclusion of the impossible."

I can also recall that another literary hero of English origin - Father Brown (also a detective, but created by the fantasy of Gilbert Keith Chesterton) - subtly drew the line between the impossible and the unbelievable. So, for example, the English prime minister at a palace reception, in principle, can publicly slap the queen on the shoulder and offer her a cigar -

there is nothing impossible in that.

However, this is absolutely incredible.

Lavrenty Beria knew how to write, knew the Russian language, and therefore it is not only possible, but also likely that he kept diaries published by the Kremlin. There is nothing impossible or improbable in such an assumption.

Nevertheless, contrary to logic, contrary to the principles of the two great detectives, Professor Kozlov, without citing any substantive evidence, assures the public that Beria's Diaries cannot be anything other than a "forgery."

N-yes...

But the authors of the monograph "Who Wrote The Quiet Flows the Don?" cautiously ask the question: "Is it possible to measure the style?" - and answer it like this:

"In full measure, of course not. However, some elements of style can certainly be measured. So, if we compare the samples of the text of "Belkin's Tales" and "War and Peace", we immediately find that

these two works have different sentence lengths. Pushkin's prose is characterized by short sentences, while Tolstoy prefers long and complex ones. Another parameter that has been successfully used to determine stylistic differences is word length. If we draw a curve showing how long words occur in Shakespeare's works, it turns out that he most often used four-letter words, while three-letter words are most typical for Bacon. Obviously, this message will not please those scientists who claim that Shakespeare's plays were written by Bacon ... "

Yes, looking at the current "Russian" reality, Francis Bacon can be understood – to use a certain word of three letters today draws, alas, more often than of four.

By the way, I offer Professor Kozlov completely free of charge (that is, free of charge) another "argument" in favor of his version that "Kremlev is the true author of Beria's Diaries."

Since in the "Diaries" not very normative vocabulary is not so rare, then, on the basis that Kremleva, judging by his statement, is drawn to use a word of three letters, we can talk about the authorship of Kremlev.

True, with this approach it is not entirely clear what to do with Bacon. He also preferred three-letter words. And, perhaps, he wrote Beria's Diaries?

Speaking seriously, modern linguistics provides very representative opportunities for establishing authorship, although, as the researchers themselves emphasize, not always with a high degree of probability. I remind you that

151

the Swedish-Norwegian research team used serious statistical methods, taking into account the coefficient of vocabulary; words that begin and end sentences; arrangement of words in a sentence, etc.

And as a result of such a huge, long-term work, the researchers came to the following conclusion, a significant part of which I give below:

"An author accused of plagiarism runs the risk of being convicted and punished. In criminal trials, however, the burden of proof is on the prosecution. If the court has doubts about whether it has sufficient evidence of the defendant's guilt, he must be acquitted. The Quiet Flows the Don is not an anonymous work. It was published by Mikhail Sholokhov, and accordingly, he should be considered the sole author until proven otherwise..."

This is a really logical and scientific approach.

Professor Kozlov does not accuse anyone of plagiarism. If we look at the situation through the prism of plagiarism, then we can say that, referring to the conclusions of Professor Kozlov about the ownership of the authorship of the "Diaries" by the Kremlin, the Kremlin could accuse Beria of plagiarism. The diaries were published in his name!

However, the Kremlin does not do this.

The Scandinavian researchers would have placed the burden of proof on the accusation of Kremlev of literary forgery not on me, but on Professor Kozlov.

But he didn't provide evidence. Sufficient

152

proof can only be an indication of the discrepancy between the information of the "Diaries" and reliable historical data. And Professor Kozlov does not point out a single discrepancy!

Moreover! Professor Kozlov also did not prove that the style and language of Beria's original texts, when compared with the style and language of the Diaries, indicate the inauthenticity of the text, that it does not belong to Beria.

Professor Kozlov bypassed this question altogether.

But there is the text of the Diaries, there are books by Kremlev, there are, although not numerous, but genuine texts by Beria ...

Take it, compare it – just like the Scandinavians did.

But no!

Of course, even if a comparison of the original texts of Kremlev and the text of Beria's Diaries does not reveal Kremlev's "paternity", Professor Kozlov can say that Kremlev, used another source. Namely: he previously studied the work of Swedish linguists and took it into account in his work on the "forgery".

But here let me object that anything can be assumed like this - up to the fact that Kremlev was allegedly engaged in table-turning and that the text of L.P. Beria was presented to him (the Kremlin) "on a silver platter" by an unnamed group of spiritualists.

By the way, something else to the question of style. Recently, the architect Igor Kalashnikov called me and said that he was greatly impressed by Beria's Diaries. Despite the pleasantness of such an assessment for the publisher, one can

153

it would not be mentioned if it were not for one, in my opinion, a very remarkable opinion of a professional.

A professional not in literature, but in architecture.

So, the architect Kalashnikov is convinced that (I quote) "the one who wrote this diary has a purely architectural way of thinking."

Knowing his professional environment well, Kalashnikov believes that the text of the diaries was written by an architect by vocation, and the author of this text cannot be anyone else, that "a person of another profession would not write such a diary."

When I asked for concrete examples from at least the first volume of the diaries as an illustration, I received examples a couple of days later. So, the architect Kalashnikov noticed that the author of the diary reveals a specific craving for the word "build"...

"Well, a whole republic has been built. Building is more interesting..." (vol. 1, p. 43).

"..And before that we built a lot, and now we will build even more. We will build Second Ways... We will build new hydropower stations... We must fundamentally rebuild the GULAG..." (vol. 1, p. 153), etc.

Beria does not pave the way, but builds, he also builds tanks, like the republic. The word "build" goes through the text like a refrain, like an expression of a creative impulse. And this is not my opinion, but the opinion of the reader of L.P. Beria.

Arguments about many common problems, according to Igor Kalashnikov, also have a special, building "architectonics". An architect, a builder thinks from the foundation. And just this one approach

154

the author of the diary... For example, in his reflections on the essence of power (vol. 1, p. 73), on the reform of the NKVD, intelligence, border troops (vol. 1, p. 99), on foreign policy problems ( vol. 1, pp. 136-137).

As an interesting point, Igor Kalashnikov regards the specific form of the use of the word "project" - in the form of an outdated "project". Beria studied "as a builder" before the revolution and in the first years of the revolution, when the second form was normative, and this, as we see, ingrained into him for life.

Igor Kalashnikov also sees the specific "construction" as the fact that the author of the diaries perceives the management function also as an architect, a builder. At that time, it was the architect who supervised the construction, so the future architects and builders were instilled with complex thinking. Namely, this is how the author of the diaries thinks.

Even the surprise of L.P. Beria with those disorders that are found in aviation, where, it would seem, discipline, control, etc. are especially important, the architect Kalashnikov refers to the "architecton-

to the "Chemical" style of L.P. Beria.

Well, this opinion of a smart professional builder is a good additional psychological evidence in favor of the authenticity of the text of the diaries. After all, L.P. Beria is not only had an architectural and construction education, but also gravitated toward architecture as original master.

No wonder some people think that those famous steeple Moscow "skyscrapers" that are habitually called "Stalinist", it would be more correct to call them "Beria".

As for Sergei Kremlev, he, as

155

Sergey Brezkun, graduated with honors from the Kharkov Order of Lenin aviation institute. NOT. Zhukovsky with a degree in aircraft engines (that is, liquid rocket engines), and he was awarded the qualification of "engineer mechanic".

At the same time, I have worked all my professional life in the oldest national center development of nuclear weapons in "Arzamas-16".

And I do not regret at all both that I graduated not from an architectural university, but the one that I graduated from, and about the fact that he got into the "firm" he got into, not regretting the architectural and planning workshop...

I seem to have mastered the engineering way of thinking. But architecturally - definitely not!

Let us return, however, to the "Quiet Don" and studies of its authenticity...

I must say, dear academicians, that if you state something, it does not prevent you from proving it. Especially since the question, as we shall now see, is not so simple.

The Russian (still Soviet) preface to the book of Scandinavian linguists was written by the well-known cultural figure Pyotr Palievsky. Small in volume, this preface is nevertheless very useful for the purposes of this book, and I will give extracts from it below, but first I will acquaint the reader with an extensive quotation from the book of Academician Dm. Likhachev "The Great Heritage".

Pyotr Palievsky begins his preface with this quotation, and this illustrative quotation, in fact, makes up almost half of the entire preface of Palievsky.

Here is what DM wrote. Likhachev and what P. Paliev

he considered it appropriate to refer so extensively (emphasis in bold italics is mine — S.K.):

"The work of the Kyiv Grand Duke Vladimir Monomakh, known under the name "Instruction", written at the end of x! - the beginning of the XI century. "Instruction" came to us quite by accident, in a single list, as part of the Laurentian Chronicle, which risked burning along with in the Moscow fire of 1812 in the collection of manuscripts of Musya na-Pushkin, but did not burn down only because it was taken from the library of N.M. Karamzin.

One can be absolutely sure that if the Laurentian Chronicle had burned down, then Vladimir Monomakh's "Instruction" would have been declared a forgery and its authenticity would have been protected.

it is much more difficult than it is now to defend the authenticity of the Tale of Igor's Campaign. "Teaching" no way was not reflected in subsequent Russian literature, it is not mentioned anywhere..."

Isn't it true that this is said almost about the "Diaries" of Beria? Before their publication, about them, too, not nothing was known.

However, further Dm. Likhachev, referring to Monomakh's "Instruction", writes this and that, which also makes one recall the debate around Beria's "Diaries":

"... the text of the "Instruction" ... is, it would seem, an "explicit" insertion; Monomakh's private letter and autobiography, which are contained in the Teaching, are unusual for the literature of the 11th-12th centuries... One can... cite... many other arguments in defense of the falsity of the Teaching..."

But! But then Academician Likhachev continues:

"...Fortunately, the manuscript of Monomakh's writings has been preserved, and there are no suspicions about it. calls."

157

This is understandable - Vladimir Monomakh did not interfere with Vladimir Lenin, and in Soviet times the tsarist archives were kept better than under the tsar.

But Lavrenty Beria really interfered with many both during his lifetime and beyond the grave (which, however, Lavrenty Pavlovich, most likely, did not have).

Therefore, it is unlikely that the original manuscript of the Diaries can be found anywhere today ... It was during the time of Bulgakov, a contemporary of Beria, that manuscripts did not burn in Russia. But the "fires" of Khrushchev's "fight against the cult", Gorbachev's-Yeltsin's "catastrophe" and Putin's-Medvedev's "fight against the falsification of history" turned out to be and are turning out to be more disastrous for Russian archives than even the famous Moscow fire of 1812. ..

Professor Kozlov wonders why Kremlev needed to create fake diaries of Beria and answers his own question like this:

"If we are guided by the first formula of the typology of documentary falsifications — the goal achievement formula (initiation of forgery + fabrication of forgery = goals of forgery) — the goal pursued by the forger becomes obvious: the rehabilitation of Beria, and through him — of Stalinism in general."

I have already written that Professor Kozlov has no grounds for expressing unambiguous opinions about any of my intentions. He didn't drink brotherhood with me, we didn't sit at the same desk, I didn't pour out my soul to him ...

Therefore, I recommend Professor Kozlov to answer only for himself.

I have said more than once and I will repeat once again that for the purpose of historical rehabilitation L.P. Beria, I wrote enough in my own name to

158

to hide - in order to rehabilitate L.P. Beria, for his name.

I can say the same about the era of Stalin - it does not need rehabilitation at all, since only ignorant ignoramuses can deny its power, greatness and necessity for Russia.

Or - knowledgeable scoundrels.

Dmitry Likhachev in his book "The Great Heritage" (pp. 111-112), speaking of possible attempts to declare Monomakh's "Instruction" a "fake",

ironically:

"... Explain why it was necessary at the end of HM! centuries to compose Monomakh's "Instruction", one could say: Monomakh is the ancestor of the Moscow sovereigns, his hat is a symbol of the monarchical

power, and his "Instruction" justified it..."

This kind of irony is also appropriate in relation to Professor Kozlov, who arbitrarily arrogated to himself the right to speak out for others.

And here is Peter Palievskiy:

"The work referred to in the proposed book also arose in the regions where the desire was once born to "drink the Don with helmets," only incomparably more of these "helmets" died at the bottom of the river. His manuscript was also burned down (as was the manuscript of The Tale of Igor's Campaign — S.K.) — an invasion more terrible than the war of 1812. And it causes no less desire to prove its falsity than The Tale of Igor's Campaign. This work is "Quiet Flows the Don" by M.A. Sholokhov.

Indeed: why is Russian classics under such strong negative attention? There is The Tale of Igor's Campaign, and Grozny's correspondence with Kurbsky, and documents of the well-known heresy of Theodosius Kosoy... Twice in our century, very thorough work was carried out to prove how cunning

159

"glued" Tolstoy from materials unknown to the public "War and Peace". Why is it that Pushkin, on the contrary, was able to create genuine "Songs of the Western Slavs" from the undoubted fake of Merimee? Raised Jeanne d'Arc from mocking annihilation? History will someday answer these, admittedly, difficult questions..."

The question above was asked in essence, and it can be attributed not only to the situation with Russian classics, but also with the history of the USSR, with the history of the era of Stalin and Beria...

And the honest answer will be similar!

Russian classics, like Russian, and especially Soviet, history, are under such strong negative attention precisely because the very fact of their existence in world culture and the history of the world is hated by all world and domestic bastards.

To HER, this supposedly rotten "elite", both the writer Sholokhov and the statesman Beria are equally hated.

Sholokhov — because he became a great Soviet writer and a prominent figure in Soviet society during Stalin's time.

Beria because he was a great reformer and a bright figure of the Stalin era.

I don't know if Sholokhov and Beria ever talked. The collision with the intercession of Sholokhov, when in October 1938 he turned to Stalin about unjustified repressions in the Vyoshensky district, took place with the participation of the People's Commissar of Internal Affairs Yezhov.

Beria, although he already worked in the NKVD of the USSR, was just entering the work and was then engaged in establishing affairs in the GUGB of the NKVD of the USSR.

But Beria and Sholokhov did the same thing, albeit in different directions.

Sholokhov worked in the field of culture, Beria - in the field of state building, but they were united by the fact that Sholokhov worked in the field of Soviet culture, and Beria - in Soviet state building.

Decades later, as we see, they were "united" by one more thing – the doubt about whether they own the texts publicly declared to be theirs.



And this, too, has, perhaps, some higher meaning.

Theme UI

## "CASE OF BERIA" AND THE BUSINESS OF "DEMOCRATS"

With the theme of the diaries of L.P. Beria turned out to be connected and another topic, which, I must admit, I am a little proud of.

Here's the thing...

Immediately after Professor Kozlov's article "Rehabilitation by forgery is like in the cinema" in issue 2 of Rodina magazine, under the heading "Book collapse", there was a report that the publishing house "Kuchkovo Pole" published a collection of documents "Politburo and the case of Beria.

In the Rodina magazine about this thousand-page "brick", published under the general editorship of O.B. Mozokhin, it was said as follows:

"The collection of documents includes the most informative materials, which cover the preparation and conduct of the trial of L.P. Beria and his entourage. The bulk of the documents have been declassified recently and are being introduced into scientific (well, well. - S.K.) circulation for the first time. Published documents were previously inaccessible to researchers, which made it difficult to conduct a full-fledged analysis of this process. This collection aims to expand the understanding of the public (within the circulation as much as a "whole" thousand copies).

162

ditch at a retail price of one copy of more than 1000 rubles. — S.K.) about this until now closed case. The published materials allow us to trace the process of preparing and making decisions on the charges against L.P. Beria and his entourage in state crimes.

Having read this message, I immediately thought: "Is it not my, including, modest efforts that led to such a considerable result as at least partial declassification of the investigative materials on the "Beria case"?"

Of course, the process of declassifying and preparing for open publication any previously classified materials is not easy and takes a lot of time. Therefore, the almost simultaneous appearance in print of Beria's diaries and a collection of documents about the "Beria case" could be a coincidence. However, acquaintance with the collection itself, perhaps, clarified something.

I'll start over...

Already on the first page of the preface (p. 3 of the collection) it says:

Quite a lot has been written about Beria. However, publications are controversial. Someone considers him an outstanding statesman, someone an executioner. Some - a folk hero, others - a depraved, morally corrupt person and a spy ... "

At the bottom of the page under footnote 1 is a list of 11 sources. Being familiar with almost all of them, I must report that only in one Beria is certified relatively objectively (Rubin N. Lavrenty Beria. Myth and reality. - M.: Smolensk, 1998).

163

At the same time, the compilers included in the list of "sources" a primitive fake of a certain A. Williams "Beria's Diaries". I wrote about her in the preface to the first volume of L.P. Beria.

Well, I was forced to somehow mention this dirty opus and briefly analyze and evaluate it - I was forced to do so by the very topic of the diaries. But can a researcher of history who at least somehow respects himself and his subject voluntarily not only refer to Williams's fake, but even mention it at all?

And if we mention it, then only in order to completely and unconditionally disavow it, which O.B. Mozokhin did not.

On the other hand, the authors of the preface to the collection of documents about the "Beria case" did not consider it necessary to mention such, for example, undoubtedly interesting and objective books about L.P. Beria, as "Unknown Beria" by Alexei Toptygin, "Killers of Stalin and Beria" by Yuri Mukhin, the works of Ivan Chigirin and Arsen Martirosyan, limiting himself to referring only to one Elena Prudnikova, whose books about Beria are undoubtedly significant, but do not exhaust the normative, so to speak, "beriana".

To the "most balanced" compilers of the collection of documents O.B. Mozokhin and A.Yu. Popov took the book by A. Sukhomlinov "Who are you, Lavrenty Beria?", Published in 2003. They report that the book "is written on documentary materials and gives the most objective picture of the former People's Commissar of the NKVD and the Minister of Internal Affairs."

Actually, already such a representation of L.P. Beria to the reader borders on the falsification of history, since among the paramount party and

164

government posts that Beria held at various times and in which he brilliantly showed himself as a creator and organizer, an objective historian simply cannot but name the posts of the first secretary of the Transcaucasian regional committee of the CPSU (b), the first secretary of the CP (b) of Georgia, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, Deputy and First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, member and Deputy Chairman of the GKO and, finally, Chairman of the "Atomic Rocket" Special committee under the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

It's not a formality! The outstanding contribution of L.P. Beria in his era is not limited. Moreover, even the outstanding security officer Beria is inferior to Beria, the reformer of Georgia, the organizer of the defense of the Caucasus, the round-the-clock organizer and head of the defense work of the rear during the war, the head of the post-war economy and the curator of the nuclear problem.

But the fact that the compilers of the collection of documents on the "Beria case" highly appreciate no more than a tolerable (from the standpoint of objectivity) book by A. Sukhomlinov, I ask the reader to remember.

This fact will come in handy for us shortly.

And now - about the connection between the collection of documents about the "Beria case" and the diaries of L.P. Beria ... As it turned out, I was not mistaken in my initial assumption about the possibility of such a connection, and this was confirmed, voluntarily or involuntarily, by the compilers of the "Beria" collection.

Here is how they write about it in the preface to the collection:

165

"Recently, publications have appeared in which the authors are trying to identify the "true role and significance" of Lavrenty Beria for Soviet history" (footnote 4 at the bottom of the page lists three books by E. Prudnikova. - S.K.). The writer S. Brezkun-Kremlev spoke about Beria in the book "Beria. The best manager of the 20th century"<sup>5</sup>. But what is surprising, later he "found" (? - S.K.) the diaries of Lavrenty Beria, which were allegedly declassified (? - S.K.) and revealed the true face of "the most famous head of the NKVD"..."

I need to explain right now...

I never wrote anywhere that I "found" the diaries. I wrote only that I received their text. Moreover, he clearly and clearly described how and under what circumstances and in what form I received this text.

However, we will talk about this side of the issue later, and - in a very detailed way - when considering the seventh topic "Why were Beria's diaries handed over to the Kremlin the way they were handed over to him."

Further, the authors of the preface demonstrate such an amusing "naivety" that they make one recall the girl from the "fun house" who informs the client that her mother and father told her that they found her in cabbage and that she personally still the day rests in the certainty that it was so...

Well, in fact, only by raising "innocent" eyes to grief, you can write the following lines:

"... However, no diaries of Beria were sent to the Interdepartmental Commission for the Protection of State Secrets for declassification" ...

Of course it didn't! Firstly, where did the original diaries of Beria come from, if, according to the testimony of even his hatred

166

stnikov, archival materials of Beria in Khrushchev's times were destroyed by bags! By the way, how does the lawyer O. Mozokhin think - did the contents of these bags, before turning into ashes, pass an examination for possible declassification or not?

Secondly, what claims about not sending Beria's diaries to some kind of Interdepartmental Commission can we talk about if academic historians from the threshold deny the very possibility of the existence of such diaries and categorically (and without proof at the same time) declare their supposed forgery?

In the preface to the collection of documents on the "Beria case", it is caustically stated:

"In connection with this (the publication of the diaries of L.P. Beria. - S.K.), it can be assumed that if there is a demand for this kind of literature, then sensational diaries of other members of the Politburo may soon appear, including including I.V. Stalin..."

However, irony is misplaced here.

On the one hand, L.P. Beria turned out to be in fact the only member of the "classical" Stalinist Politburo who did not die at a ripe old age, but was destroyed in the prime of his life, at the age of fifty-four. All the rest - Molotov, Malenkov, Mikoyan, Kaganovich, Voroshilov, Khrushchev, Bulganin - died at an advanced age and had every opportunity to legally leave behind memoirs or diaries - if they kept them. Some people left memoirs after themselves - in one form or another.

On the other hand, if the members of the "Stalinist"

167

The Politburo kept diaries, then they would have been published long ago by the heirs - there would have been no obstacles to this in any case.

On the third hand, it is really possible (the market is the market) that other "sensational" diaries of Politburo members will appear, except, of course, I.V. Stalin. But here

their authenticity will be undoubted only if such diaries are found precisely in the form of originals and found and published precisely by the heirs of the members of the Politburo.

The case with the texts of diaries and other materials of L.P. Beria is unique and therefore does not fit into the usual framework. Isn't that incomprehensible?

No Molotov, no Malenkov, no Mikoyan, no Kaganovich, no Voroshilov, no Khrushchev, no Bulganin, and so on. no one ever arrested, no one searched their homes, so that any forcible, against the will of the authors, seizure of their materials by the authorities was practically excluded.

As for Beria, everything was different here, and is it necessary to continue this idea further?

Returning to the preface to the collection of "Beria" documents, I confess that the following passage from the preface turned out to be the most flattering for me:

"In order to protect protect (the word "protect" is repeated twice in the text of the preface, apparently, its authors really wanted to protect readers from the Kremlin. — S.K.) researchers from this kind of "diaries and memoirs" and documents are published, which allow objectively (that's how! - S.K.) to reflect historical events ... "

168

In other words, the compilers of the collection themselves directly admitted that my publication of the diaries of L.P. Beria forced semi-official historians to take some countermeasures, one of which was the partial declassification of the materials of the "Beria case".

Incidentally, the typo (or misspelling) "protect protect" can be attributed to the "moment of truth" according to, so to speak, Freud. The subconscious worked. Apparently, the compilers of the collection really wanted to protect readers from the bad influence of the Kremlin.

Well, for the sake of one such result, it was worth living and fighting, as they say.

Of all the members of the Stalinist Politburo, Nikita Khrushchev left the most voluminous and full-length memoirs, and in his case, the words "memoirs" and "memoirs" must be put in quotation marks - there are a lot of them, not just exaggerations and exaggerations, but direct, a fairly easy-to-detect lie.

That's what to write to Professor Kozlov and his colleagues in the Department of History of the Russian Academy of Sciences! This is what the publishers of investigative materials on Beria should also pay attention to.

However, the obviously fake ones are fake not by their authorship, because Khrushchev, as I understand it, really dictated what was published in the West on his behalf, and the fake ones in tone and historical essence are Khrushchev's "memoirs" for today's semi-official "historians". " is a "historical source". And the "source" is precisely because Khrushchev's anti-Stalin and anti-Beria "memoirs" are anti-historical and falsify history.

The current semi-official "historians" openly hate (more precisely, as I understand it, they "hate" in ka

169

habits, for a decent fee) of the Soviet era. Therefore, for example, all those Soviet names that should be written with capital letters, they write with lowercase ...

Not "Hero of Socialist Labor", but "hero of socialist labor", not "Politburo", but "according to the Litburo", etc.

If this were not against the rules of even the current illiterate "grammar", then they would write the names of Lenin, Stalin and Beria with a small letter.

On the other hand, they always write "Sovereign Emperor" in capital letters, experiencing, presumably, truly "loyal", that is, servile, delight.

What can I say?

Well, there's a lot to be said, and in essence...

But is it worth it?

However, by the way, in parentheses, if we are talking about grammar, it would not hurt the authors of the preface to decide on cases and declensions. Either they mention the diaries of Beria, then the diaries of Beria, and so on.

I, despite its Caucasian origin, consciously incline the name "Beria" in the male version, emphasizing that I consider Lavrenty Pavlovich as the son of not only the Georgian, but also the Russian people. But Mr. Mozokhin is confused with her declension.

Of course, this trifle could not have been mentioned if the academicians Kozlov-Mozokhins and Co. had not gotten confused in much more serious things. If we take the same preface to the collection of documents about the "Beria case", then this preface is simply overflowing not with exact data, but with idle

170

women's rumors and gossip, incorrect assumptions and factual inaccuracies - both small and large.

Small ones include, for example, the message that "On January 30, 1941, Beria was awarded the title of" State Commissar of State Security "...".

Oil, of course, is oil, and the Commissar of State Security is a truly state figure, but L.P. On January 30, 1941, Beria was awarded the title of General Commissar of State Security of the USSR.

More unacceptable inaccuracies include the message that in February 1941, Beria "was appointed Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars (I keep the spelling of the preface, although the normative spelling is in capital letters. — S.K.) of the USSR where he supervised the work of the security agencies".

In fact, the functions of L.P. Beria as Deputy Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR were much broader: from February 1941, he began to oversee a number of sectors of the economy, and just those that turned out to be "in a breakthrough".

The same fundamental and, most likely, deliberate "inaccuracy" is O. Mozokhin's statement that "...in the future, the leading role in managing the project to create a hydrogen bomb also passed to those headed by him ( L.P. Beria. - S.K.) NKVD - MVD .. ".

Such a statement is not only false, it is blatantly illiterate! Neither the NKVD of the USSR, nor even the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR, ever led any atomic project, starting with the project of creating the first Soviet atomic bomb. The authors of the preface

171

still do not mention the Special Committee under the Council of People's Commissars (CM) of the USSR, chaired by L.P. Beria became from August 1945! But all the "atomic" work in the USSR was led by the Special Committee, and not the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs, which, by the way, L.P. Beria ceased to lead from the end of 1945.

In the preface to the collection, it is illiterately and anti-historically stated that "...documents testify that... Beria's merits were greatly exaggerated. First of all, the main role in the creation of atomic weapons ("first of all, the main role", well, well. - S.K.) was played by large state funding.

The "profound thinking" of the last statement borders, excuse me, on cretinism.

The sun certainly rises in the east, and the success of any major project is impossible without a lot of funding. However, in today's "Rossiyaniya" one hears from time to time about "large state funding" of various "modernization" projects, and the results for some reason turn out to be directly opposite to those achieved under the leadership of Beria.

What is it?

Perhaps it is important not only how much money is allocated and for what, but also who spends it and on what?

Beria knew how to doom to success any business that Stalin and the era entrusted to him. And the secret was not in Beria's alleged "stick", and not even in his "carrot", but in the undoubted managerial competence of the great manager of socialism, in his ability to find people, rely on their best qualities and believe them.

Publishers of materials on the "Beria case" can

172

exclaim here: "Ah, got caught, such and such a Kremlin! Now we will quote an extract from the protocol of the interrogation of Beria's son, and it will immediately become clear what Beria relied on in reality!

Well, the time will come to analyze this "confession" of Sergo Beria.

Documents are, of course, different between documents, but it is precisely the documents of the Soviet Atomic Project that reveal the paramount, outstanding role of L.P. Beria in the elimination of the US nuclear monopoly and the creation of Soviet nuclear weapons.

It was the long-term work on the declassification and publication of documents of the Soviet Atomic Project that led one of the major Sarov theoretical physicists, Hero of Socialist Labor and Lenin Prize laureate German Arsenievich Goncharov, to the conclusion that in matters of atomic work, Beria understood at the level of Doctor of Technical Sciences!

It is sad and amusing that the authors of the preface, clearly thinking of themselves as infallible "Olympians", say:

"It should be noted that very many researchers cite Beria's autobiography, which he himself wrote (in fact, people write autobiographies themselves. — S.K.), which, in our opinion, sins with many inaccuracies"...

However, the authors of the preface themselves present the biography of L.P. Beria is so indistinct and inaccurate that one can only shrug. And such, so to speak, "experts" are taken to judge the authenticity or falsification of the text of the diaries of L.P. Beria.

173

Perhaps it is necessary to say a few words about the collection of archival materials on the "Beria case" itself ...

When certain archival, previously closed, materials are published, it can be assumed that, first of all, documents are selected for publication either the most informative - if the publishers are objective, or the most supporting the concept of the publishers and their customers - if the publishers are dishonest.

Naturally, I did not have access to the investigative materials on the "Beria case", but prosecutor Sukhomlinov had access to them. It was he who said that these materials were summarized in 37 volumes. There was plenty to choose from!

So the publishers who wish to "expose" Beria and show his true, that is, according to the publishers, unseemly and negative, appearance, had to choose the most "revealing", the most "savory" ...

So what did they post?

If we carefully analyze what has been made public, we can understand that despite the abundance of material, the compilers failed to create a reliably confirmed negative image of Beria. Beria does not look negative not only as a statesman, but also as a person - a careful analysis rather proves the opposite.

And this despite the fact that the compilers had discrediting tasks in relation to Beria!

The documents selected for publication do not support the official version about the execution of L.P. Beria on December 23, 1953, that is, after the official verdict. Published documents rather refute it!

I have already written more than once (and once again touched

174

this moment when considering the topic of the third "Unfunny "detectives" by Veniamin Smekhov") that L.P. Beria was hardly shot by the verdict of the Special Judicial Presence of the Supreme Court of the USSR on December 23, 1953. But he was not killed during the mythical "storm" of his mansion on June 26, 1953.

Most likely, after the arrest on June 26, 1953, Beria was really interrogated during July - a number of July and even August protocols of interrogations contain such details that only Beria could know. But after the extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in early August 1953, at which Beria was finally disavowed as a deputy, the living Beria became more and more dangerous and uncomfortable.

And, most likely, no later than the middle or end of August 1953, he was extrajudicially executed.

Indirectly, this assumption of mine is confirmed by the fact that the collection of documents on the "Beria case" contains interrogation protocols dated July 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, and already for July 23, 24, 27, etc. only copies of the protocols of interrogations of L.P. Beria. Lies were mixed with the truth.

And only for October 19, 1953, the protocol itself is again given in the original. But Beria's almost telegraph replies allow us to assume that we are dealing with "answers" in quotation marks, and the signature on the protocol is fake.

For some reason, the interrogation protocols of L.E. Vlodzimirsky, S.A. Goglidze, B.Z. Kobulova, V.N. Merkulov and others are given in the collection only in copies. And where, one wonders, are the originals, which should bear the authentic signatures of the interrogated?

And why, even in copies in the collection, there is not a single protocol of interrogations of V.G. Dekanozov and P.Ya. Meshik, who passed with L.P. Beria, L.E. Vlodzimirsky, S.A. Goglidze, B.Z. Kobulov and V.N. Merkulov in one case?

That is, the publication of part of the investigative materials on the "Beria case" does not answer any objective question, but immediately raises many new questions.

The general impression of the entire array of "declassified" "documents" is that where it is skillfully, and where it is clumsily prepared, a mixture of truth and lies, from genuine information and fake "information", from confessions and "confessions" ...

The most significant thing is that the collection does not contain a single protocol (or at least a copy of the protocol) of a single confrontation of L.P. Beria with his former subordinates.

In fact, already in 2003, a professional lawyer, prosecutor A. Sukhomlinov, pointed to this in his book "Who are you, Lavrenty Beria?". I remind you that it is this book that the compilers of the collection of documents about the "Beria case" evaluate as "the most balanced", written "on documentary materials" and giving "the most objective idea of the former People's Commissar of the NKVD and the Minister of Internal Affairs".

. Sukhomlinov was the only one who was admitted to Beria's 37-volume investigative file, and even a lawyer loyal to the Yeltsinoid regime expressed a number of doubts about the quality of the investigation. Perhaps against his will, but Sukhomlinov wrote about Beria as a lively and very attractive personality. This is the undoubted merit of A. Sukhomlinov's book.

But in 2003, the main "rehabilitation", so to speak, books about Beria had not yet been published, and the detractors of Beria were not very vigilant. Why, perhaps, Sukhomlinov's careless evidence flew out that Beria was not included in 37 volumes of the "investigative" "case" no traces of face-to-face confrontations with him.

But this is almost proof that Beria was killed during the investigation, and not by the verdict of the Special Judicial Presence, and was killed quite early!

Let's think about the situation, knowing what we know for sure today.

In the first month - July 1953 - the investigators of the brigade of the "Khrushchev" Prosecutor General of the USSR Roman Rudenko had enough worries to develop the primary authentic material of the interrogations of Beria and his fellow prisoners. At the same time, the investigators could have accumulated some facts and Beria's answers in order to write future falsified protocols during that period of the "investigation", when Beria would no longer be alive.

There was no particular need for face-to-face confrontations at the initial stage of the investigation - the investigators were only groping for the tactics and strategy of the investigation in the case of such experienced investigators as Beria and his former subordinates. Face-to-face bets at this stage could only interfere.

Presumably, the style of the answers was also thought out in order to ensure future qualified falsification of interrogation protocols.

After the August session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, for the future killers of Beria, certain legal guarantees of impunity for extrajudicial reprisals against Beria were already created, and conditions



A line for its physical liquidation has been formed. And a speedy liquidation was needed by many, starting with Khrushchev and ending with the leaders of the West and the supranational golden elite.

On the other hand, the murder of Beria and the showing of his corpse (or even his execution) to six persons under investigation: Vlodzimirsky, Goglidze, Dekanozov, Kobulov, Merkulov and Meshik could become a decisive, turning point, ensuring that all six were fully prepared to show anything and sign anything.

After that, of course, there could be no talk of any confrontations with Beria for purely "technical" reasons.

No, it's up to you, gentlemen of the jury, but something here does not fit one with the other, something does not connect.

Familiarity with directly investigative documents also does not convince of their persuasiveness, but it allows us to assume, I repeat, either a direct forgery, or some kind of conglomerate, sometimes an aggregate of truth and lies.

And let me reiterate this...

As already mentioned, for the collection of documents allegedly exposing Beria, the compilers, according to the logic of "revealing", had to select the most "shocking", the most "stunning" and "revealing" documents and confessions of Beria.

And there is nothing so stunning in the collection!

If something similar is sometimes found there, then such "revelations" clearly smell of falsification or brute pressure.

If, for example, we compare the testimony of Beria's wife (or already a widow?) - Nino Beria - dated 19 July

178

1953 and her own letter to Khrushchev dated January 7, 1954, we will see that the inconsistencies between the two documents stick out like an awl from a bag. Moreover, the second document is probably close to reality, and it has L.P. Beria has a positive meaning.

Roughly, rudely, the "investigative" "case" of Beria was worked out ...

The publication of the materials of Beria's "case" turned out to be rude as well. So, for example, a thick volume of documents, prepared as a de facto official scientific publication, is not provided with absolutely no scientific reference apparatus (comments, notes, etc.), except for an extremely incomplete name index.

I was especially struck by the placement in the collection of documents (!) without any comments of a letter addressed to Malenkov from a certain "member of the CPSU (! - S.K.) Malsagov Dziaudin Gabisovich, living: Kazakh SSR, Taldy-Kurgan Region - last, Tekeli, P. Kordon, Zarechnaya, 16, apt. eleven".

The letter is dated July 11, 1953, and on August 8, 1953, it was addressed to the "Beria case" with a note that Molotov, Khrushchev, Bulganin and Rudenko got acquainted with it.

Here is what, in particular, Dziaudin Malsagov wrote:

"In February 1944, the Regional Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic sent me to the Galanchezhsky district of the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic to assist in the eviction of the Chechen-Ingush population ...

... On January 27, 1944, on the farm (bold italics mine. - S.K.) Khaibakha of the Nashkhoevsky village council of the Galanchezhsky district in the morning at the beginning of the resettlement, it was announced to people: whoever cannot follow, go due to old age, illness , pregnancy,

179

youth, etc., they will be sent by a separate transport column.

In such a fraudulent way, the sick, pregnant women, old people, children, etc. were gathered, herded into a collective farm livestock building - a large stable, previously covered with hay, doused with fuel, closing the doors, in which they burned alive more than 600 people the elderly, children, sick, pregnant women, etc. by setting fire to the entire building. Eyewitnesses of this atrocity, besides me, are Gaev Jendar, who lives in Alma-Ata, Gaev Mukhadi and Mukhi, and a number of people living in the town of Tekeli, Taldy-Kurgan region...

...28.11.44, more than 500 people were burnt in the same way... in the village of Elkhara of Galanchezhsky

district..."

etc.

Actually, the analysis of this letter (and a number of other letters given in the collection of letters) can be a separate topic in my book, but I will try to be brief.

I don't know if it's necessary to say that the "horrors" described by Malsagov are completely false, because this could not have happened - because this could never have happened.

This is where this sacramental formula can be fully applied!

The point is not even that on one farm there could hardly be 600 people, only old people, children, sick, pregnant women. And not that such atrocity was absolutely impossible as an official action of the Soviet power on its own territory, even in force majeure circumstances.

No, nothing like L.P. Beria couldn't sank

180

from purely pragmatic (if the "democrats" deny him humanity) considerations.

On the one hand, such an action in a situation of mass eviction cannot be classified absolutely, you cannot hide it - at least from men from, it turns out, the many-thousand-strong farm Khaybakha...

And such an action could not but lead to such unpredictable consequences, to such an outburst of well-founded indignation of the Chechens, if it were true, which in wartime would have caused a lot of trouble.

On the other hand, the eviction action was prepared very carefully, with a massive allocation of transport. By the end of February, the eviction operation was over, so the cars. there should have been enough to transport people.

Another detail is that the civilian population of Dagestan and Ossetia, adjacent to Chechnya, was involved in the operation. The echo of two Chechen "Lidice" - if they were - could not but sweep through the Caucasus with an extremely negative effect for the USSR. Especially considering that the Chechens had good ties with Berlin.

Could Beria, a Caucasian himself, fail to understand this?

And realizing, could he sanction something like that even from, I emphasize, pragmatic considerations? After all, it was Beria who, after the war, protested against the harsh repressive policy in Western Ukraine and the Baltic states, stating that in this way we only expand the base nationalism.

Yes, they didn't particularly mess with the deportees - during transportation to Kazakhstan in the winter of 1944, 1272 people died (2.6% of the total number of special

181

settlers). And this is sad and terrible. But at that time, even Russians in some internal regions of the RSFSR sometimes died of malnutrition - the most difficult, horrific war was going on for the third year.

On the other hand, the author (?) of the letter to Malenkov himself, as follows from the letter, already in exile in 1945 graduated from the Law Institute in Alma-Ata and was appointed deputy chairman of Talda of the Kurgan regional court (!).

Does this fit in with his version of "atrocities"?..

Malsagov, in a letter dated July 11, 1953 (it must be said, this letter was written promptly) reports, among other things:

"... About these facts of the brutal extermination of Soviet people, undeserved contempt and humiliation of us (up to and including receiving a lower penalty, and a higher education. - S.K.) here, in the Kazakh SSR, in January 1945, I wrote a statement addressed to Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (b) comrade. Stalin, which did not reach Comrade. Stalin, apopolo to Beria L.P.....

So, the "executioner" Beria became aware that a witness to his crime was alive ... And what - an order is flying to Kazakhstan to "wipe him into camp dust"?

But no! Malsagov - judging by his letter - after a tough conversation with a local security officer from Kazakhs, they are only removed from the post of deputy chairman of the regional court of Taldy-Kurgan region ...

Wonderful are thy works, Lord!

If God's servant Lavrenty Beria is really guilty of what Dziyaudin Malsagov accused him of, then what, citizens, are you talking about?!

The whole appearance of Beria, built by the Kremlin and

182

other Stalinists, then collapses immediately and irrevocably - once and for all.

And here is such a "document", supposedly fatal for an objective assessment of the Stalin era, not only was it not brought into the light of God for twenty years of active "de-Stalinization", but even after it was extracted, it was not Beria's "denunciators" noticed?

It's amazing, it's amazing!

A collection of "documents" on the "Beria case" was signed for publication on 11/30/2011, in February 2012 it was advertised in the Rodina magazine and has been on sale for several months!

However, perhaps the "letter of Malsagov" will be noticed and put into circulation after the unlucky "apologist for Beria" Kremlev drew the attention of the public to it?

Uh! And here, gentlemen, you are late!

The fact is that prosecutor Sukhomlinov, who published a book about Beria's "case" almost ten years ago, got acquainted with this "case" in full and, therefore, read Malsagov's letter too - after all, it has a note dated August 1953 year - "in the case of Beria."

Why didn't prosecutor Sukhomlinov be horrified by the extreme "criminality" of Beria and didn't tell the world about it in his book?

What - such information would discredit not only Beria, but, at the same time, the Soviet government? So after all, this is what all the "official" authors are now recklessly busy with! Especially when it comes to Stalin and Beria ...

But, I think, prosecutor Sukhomlinov just turned out to have enough common sense and decency

183

in order to immediately understand the falsity and deceit of "Malsagov's letter".

So I remind the possible "accusers" of Beria that there is a ready prosecutor for their denunciations! However, not to support them, but to refute them!

In fact, even Rudenkov's team of investigators did not take this fake into account, although they did not disdain insinuations and often worked "toporno", which was also noted by prosecutor Sukhomlinov.

Was it not because everything turned out so clumsily with the Rudenkov brigade in 1953, because they were pressed by the situation - it was necessary to quickly get rid of Beria in order to exclude the possibility of his renaissance in the face of growing dissatisfaction with the increasingly unrestrained Khrushchev?

And is it not because the compilers of the collection of "documents" about the "Beria case" no less clumsily "worked" in 2012, because they were also pressed by the situation - it was necessary to quickly neutralize ("protect protect") positive for the memory of L.P. Beria, the effect caused by the wide popularity of his diaries, published and commented on by the Kremlin?

After all, the compilers of the collection themselves admitted that they undertook the publication of investigative materials on the "Beria case" in order "to protect ... researchers from this kind of" diaries and memoirs "...".

The imprint of the collection of documents "The Politburo and the Case of Beria" states:

"The publication was prepared in cooperation with the Commission under the President of the Russian Federation to counter attempts to falsify history to the detriment of Russia's interests."

184

However, acquaintance already with the preface to the collection suggests that we are dealing with a typographical error, and the words "opposing attempts" appeared in this annotation solely by typing error.

My book does not aim to give a detailed analysis of the published part of Beria's investigative file, although it would not hurt to undertake such an analysis separately. However, writing another book about L.P. Beria - books with an analysis of his "case" - are not included in my plans yet. Therefore, in conclusion, I will once again express only some impressions about this documentary publication...

It is extremely interesting, but not in the way that publishers would like to stick out. So, I was surprised to find in the collection of documents a number of confirmations that the notorious "doctors' case" was by no means

"puffy". At the same time, it becomes clearer why Beria, knowing about the fault of the doctors, nevertheless released them.

As I guess, Lavrenty Pavlovich, already knowing that Stalin was poisoned, decided not to "tease the dogs" for the time being and to pretend that he was in solidarity with the poisoner Khrushchev, who called this "case" "shameful" in assessing the "doctors' case" ...

Interesting details emerge from the materials of the investigation regarding, for example, General Meretskov and People's Commissar Vannikov. Some figures, such as L.P. Beria on the Makhnev Special Committee, are starting to look, alas, less attractive than I imagined them before.

But Beria looks quite worthy from those protocols of interrogations, which are undoubtedly authentic.

And now - about the protocol of interrogation of Beria's son Sergo, or rather, about the memorandum of Roman Ru

185

Denko in the name of Malenkov No. 164 / ssov, which contains extracts from the protocol of interrogation of S.L. Beria dated July 13, 1953.

The text of this note, in my opinion, contains genuine information in the sense that the words of Sergo Beria are conveyed correctly in it. Although in July 1953, the son behaved in relation to his father not quite worthily and even unworthily and uttered a lot of slander about him.

But here is a certain episode of Sergo Beria, as I understand it, without inventing anything.

During interrogation on July 13, 1953, he testified that at the end of 1952 he was with a number of other colleagues at a meeting in the Kremlin with his father. And there, during the discussion of one candidate, when it was said about this person that he works not for fear, but for conscience, L.P. Beria "seriously noted" that "there are no people working for conscience, everyone works only for fear."

Sergo, as he stated in July 1953, was struck by this statement of his father, and he objected - they say, how is it that "Soviet people work because of their convictions, because of their conscience" ... What Beria- the elder allegedly replied that Sergo "does not know life."

The truth is strong in that even a small truthful fact can bring down a big lie. So this fact (and I personally recognize it as a fact) crosses out the creative image of Beria? What — the image of a great manager of socialism is disappearing, who knows how to rally teams, captivate people, be able to organize work so that people work not out of fear, not under a whip, and not even for a "carrot", but for conscience. ?

Before answering this question, I will introduce the reader to another story...

186

In the "fun" "perestroika" years, in some, I don't remember in what, "source of publicity" I read the memoirs of an old worker, the meaning of which was as follows.

Here, they say, everyone talks about Lenin as about the most human person, allegedly an old St. Petersburg proletarian narrated in a badly marked year, but what an incident ...

In the first days of October, a group of Red Guards, which included our proletarian, brought a cadet boy to Smolny. And, bringing this beardless "enemy" directly to Lenin, she asked the leader - what to do with the cadet?

And here the "most humane" man, the great leader of the world proletariat, allegedly threw out on the move: "Yes, do with him what you want!"

The "old proletarian", and with him those who published his memoirs, lamented - oh, how cruel and soulless! Ah, how can one brush aside such a situation?! Ah, what if the Red Guards had gone and shot the unfortunate boy?!

And now let's think...

First, Lenin did not say, "shoot him." He actually made it clear - leave me alone, comrades, with such nonsense, not before ...

"Oh, not before?! — modern "human scientists" and "lovers of the soul" will rise up. - The fate of man is nonsense? Here they are, damned Leninist-Stalinists, ostentatious humanists!"

But let's, I repeat, think about it.

First days of October...

A deed unprecedented in world history is being accomplished—For the first time in the world, Labor takes power, and takes it "without fools"...

187

Lenin is busy almost around the clock, there are a lot of questions, and every three out of two are the most important...

Lenin is exhausted and tired, he doesn't even have the strength for emotions, he works "on automatic" ...

And close to him, in the midst of the "heap of cases and turmoil of events", suddenly several, pardon me, beautiful-hearted fools lean on him, who ask him to explain what they should do with the cadet boy?

Of course, in a bad tinsel movie based on the script of some Shatrov-Marshak, Lenin would have to immediately put aside all his affairs and take up questions and exhortations of the prisoner: "Hey, you are my friend! What are you, so young, but against the people. Can not be so. Say you won't..."

And then, wrinkling his forehead, putting his fingers behind his waistcoat, Lenin would have to say to the proletarians: "Release him in peace and the Decree on Peace. He won't be anymore. And give him some kind of pamphlet by Comrade Marx as parting, let him study ... "

But what to do! The revolution is a serious lady and requires all the strength and attention from her entourage.

And the real Lenin, swathed in "hellish work," indeed, as I understand it, brushed it aside. He was a living person! It was later that they began to make a monument out of it, and not so much in Stalin's times as in Khrushchev's and Brezhnev's times...

In opposition to Stalin.

Yes, Lenin shrugged it off. But for smart people, the essence of his go-ahead should have been quite unambiguous: "Well, why are you bothering me, comrades, with this jerk. Do what you want with him... If you want, take off your pants and beat him up, and then chase him away, but if you want, just give him a kick in the neck and send him home."

188

After all, this is how the situation will be imagined not by the court "Leninist" Shatrov-Marshak and not, sorry, blockhead Dm. Winter, but a normal person who knows life and accepts life!

Actually, the Red Guards, as people who are not far off, but normal, did just that. They gave the little bastard a punch in the face and kicked him out of Smolny.

And now back to the story of Sergo Beria.

End of 1952...

The 19th Congress of the CPSU has come to an end, there are huge and bright prospects ahead, but there are no less, if not more sick and unresolved problems.

Like no one else, perhaps, Beria knows how much has accumulated in the country, and especially in the leading strata, bureaucracy or selfish rubbish. Beria knows that soon Stalin, he and the whole country will face big changes - major personnel changes, the strengthening of the role of the Soviets, the restructuring of party work ...

Beria is tired and tired - although he had a rest this year, it seems that it was so long ago.

And here, when discussing a business issue, someone at the wrong time was drawn to "lyrics" and "philosophy" with a protest tinge. Instead of specifically discussing the qualities of the proposed candidate, someone uses a common hackneyed expression - they say, they work not out of fear, but for conscience.

Actually, there is no crime in these words, but what if at that moment Beria was annoyed by something, tired, twitched, and the world was not nice to him, but the meeting had to be held.

After all, it happens...

In addition, Beria was a man, not a god, who had eternity in store.

189

So he threw in his hearts: "There are no people working for conscience, everyone works only for fear."

Maybe at that moment he just remembered some leading bastard who did not justify trust and cheated.

Perhaps, by the way, Lavrenty Pavlovich remembered several such bastards - after all, even then such enough.

And then, inopportunely, an objector leaned out, and even someone - his own son, and began to tell his father in a manner without a gifted secretary of the party bureau that we have all the ideological.

His father threw him in response: "You are still young, you don't know life" ...

It would have been forgotten, but six months later, Beria Sr. was arrested. And Beria Jr. lost heart (I am not his judge here) and began to feverishly recall - in order to tell such and such about his father.

Here he reported.

But it's impossible, excuse me, gentlemen, comrades, one day, it's not known exactly in what situation and in what mood an abandoned phrase can be pulled out of the general context of the whole life of a large, original, over the edge busy and day after day continuously engaged in huge state work man!

Or does anyone here think otherwise?

I am proud and satisfied that my, although not only my, of course, work on the historical rehabilitation of Lavrenty Pavlovich Beria has led to the fact that modern falsifiers

history had to declassify a few more closed pages of our Soviet history.

And it turned out that there was no executioner, there was no time

190

the gatekeeper, there was no morally corrupted person and spy, but there was a really outstanding statesman who did not become a national hero precisely because he was quite worthy of it.

It turned out that even from the supposedly falsified - the only question is to what extent - the investigative case of Beria and his associates (albeit broken associates) is visible very complicated, sometimes yes, not very direct, but in general, a worthy and attractive human and historical destiny.

And last...

Even against the backdrop of the "Beria case", the purpose of which was not to reward Beria according to positive merits, but to slap him with mud, how petty, gray and vile the fates of the current alleged arbiters of the fate of our great country in the past look.

How criminal, against the background of even the "case of Beria", the deeds of the current supposedly "democrats" look.

And what can we say about how they look, these alleged arbiters of destinies, against the general background of the era of Stalin and Beria?

Topic UP

#### WHY BERIA'S DIARY WAS TRANSFERRED TO THE KREMLIN THE WAY THEY WERE TRANSFERRED

I am completely indebted to the article by Professor Kozlov for this topic. If it had not appeared in print, I would hardly have thought about the question as I thought about it after reading the article, and I would hardly have understood what I intend to say below.

So, after the publication of the first volume of Beria's diaries "Stalin Does Not Believe in Tears", in the preface to which I told in detail how I got the text of the diaries, I had to face distrust regarding the circumstances of transferring this to me. text by the mysterious "Pavel Lavrentievich".

No wonder Professor Kozlov gave the first version of his article, published in Rodina magazine, the ironic title "Rehabilitation by forgery – "like in the movies".

Indeed, everything happened like in a movie, but why did everything happen the way it happened?

Why were Beria's diaries handed over to me the way they were handed over?

This question did not leave me alone. Periodically returning to it, I searched for the answer time after time and time after time did not find it.

192

Only while thinking about the answer to academic professor Kozlov and his colleagues, I began to guess why the wise "Pavel Lavrentievich", wise for a long life, did not give me a single sheet of a photocopy of the original, although he let me hold in my hands a whole stack of such sheets.

Only now have I begun to understand this, and I think my guess is correct.



The wise "Pavel Lavrentievich" made a brilliant move: he provided Beria's diaries with the presumption of innocence!

And here's how he probably reasoned...

The originals of the diary are almost certainly not to be found today, even in the most secret archives, which is understandable. Beria, of course, is the second most creative and human significance after Stalin, the historical figure of the Stalin era. But the total discrediting of Stalin is hardly possible. The role and significance of Stalin through gritted teeth had to be recognized even by such a historical scoundrel-falsifier as Nikita Khrushchev. Silence and distort the role and significance of Stalin turned out to be too tough even for the current, completely shameless and unscrupulous scoundrels-falsifiers.

Therefore, the total destruction of archival materials that give an objective image of Stalin is not of particular fundamental importance - the era that testifies for Stalin

called by his name.

But the total discrediting of the most striking figure of the Stalin era, Lavrenty Beria, turned out to be possible for the Khrushchevites and their last ones in the destruction of the USSR. However, the objective scale of Beria was also very, very considerable.

193

And today, through the joint efforts of honest researchers of the Stalin era, this is being revealed more and more.

Such a turn of affairs could have been foreseen in advance, and, in any case, it could not be ruled out. And therefore, it was very important for the falsifiers of history to deprive honest researchers of a convincing documentary and source base for the future historical rehabilitation of L.P. Beria.

Accordingly, archival materials on Beria were destroyed especially zealously and totally, and now they are destroyed, except perhaps for the documents of the Soviet Atomic Project, almost completely clean - even if we take into account such a dubious source as Beria's multi-volume "investigative file", where there is not a single full-time bet with him.

According to a number of testimonies, Beria's papers were destroyed with sacks.

In view of all this, it is not necessary to hope for finding the originals of the diary today. It seems that "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his comrades in saving the historical heritage of Beria either knew that the originals, from which they secretly photocopied, were destroyed, or guessed about it. They could not seize the originals in any way, but they made copies. When computer technology appeared, they also created an electronic version of the materials.

I do not rule out, by the way, that, knowing Beria well, his era and its details, they could add something additional to this electronic version, but add this and that so that the additions do not distort the historical truth, but clarify it more clearly.

One way or another, in the form of photocopies, the materials of L.P. Beria were previously preserved, and by the end of the century

194

or at the beginning of the new century, these materials were also transferred to electronic media - hard drives, floppy disks and CDs.

Now the task was to publish the materials of L.P. Beria at the right time and in due form.

In Khrushchev's, Brezhnev's, Gorbachev's, in the early Yeltsin and Yeltsinoid times, it was either impossible or premature to do this. In addition, if the Pavel Lavrentievich group itself took up the matter of publishing - even after 1991, then the trouble would be over the edge - where did they get it, and on what basis?

"You violated this, you violated that ... And prove that you are people, not camels ..."

And I would have to prove it, but - to whom ?!

After all, starting from the Gorbachev era and up to the present, one can only slander the era of Stalin with impunity. This is not only welcomed, but also stimulated by various gingerbread, gingerbread and "pies" with "green" "cabbage".

But to honestly rehabilitate the era of Stalin and Beria is an unprofitable business, and on this path you will get not pies and donuts, but bruises and bumps.

I do not think that "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his group were people of the timid ten. But all the "pitfalls" of state (more precisely, anti-state) chicanery, the corruption of Gorbachev-Yeltsinoid "expertise", etc. they clearly knew firsthand. Give the original photocopies to the Yeltsinoids - they will replace them with fakes, then they will give the appropriate "conclusion", and prove that you are not a camel.

This technology was not bad, it seems, mastered, judging by the "Katyn" "documents"

195

90s. Alas, today there are too many reasons to assume that in cases inconvenient for the current regime, the words "state", "examination" and "carried out" should be

write and read in quotation marks.

Therefore, as I understand it, "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his group were careful in choosing the strategy and tactics for publishing the materials of L.P. Beria. They launched the process of their publication when a winning situation began to take shape for that, one of the details of which was the appearance of a number of objective books about Beria, including the book by Kremlev (Brezkun) about Beria as "the best manager of the 20th century".

Once again reflecting on the situation after the appearance of Professor Kozlov's article, I, it seems to me, understood "Pavel Lavrentievich" and admired him and again felt deep gratitude to him and his comrades, not only for the fact that they honored with their trust precisely me, but also for the fact that they simply brilliantly covered me up, handing me Beria's materials the way they handed them to me!

Well, actually!

Firstly, all the photocopies on sheets of approximately A4 size would not fit into not only an old crocodile skin briefcase, but even a dozen briefcases. And we only met once. Therefore, I was shown only part of the photocopies, without giving them away.

But something else is even more essential, and I realized it only recently! If "Pavel Lavrentievich" had given me, in addition to the electronic version of the materials, at least some of the photocopies or, moreover, their scans, even with hidden archival markings, etc., then he would have created for me the same potential

196

the difficulty that would have occurred for him in the event that Beria's materials were published by him.

The cries of forgery would also begin ...

An allegedly "state" supposedly "expertise" with a pre-determined "result" would also be proposed...

Etc. and so on.

But it would be easier to accuse me of fabricating photocopies or scans.

On the other hand, if the materials were put into circulation by the "Pavel Lavrentievich" group, then it would face the inevitable need to justify its actions, provide information about the "technology" and the circumstances of copying, etc.

And so "Pavel Lavrentievich" confronted not only me, but also all my possible conscientious and unscrupulous critics and opponents.

I ask the reader to be attentive and think about what has been said above and below especially carefully and carefully.

That method of transmitting to me only the text of L.P. Beria, and not photocopies of materials, untied the hands of a potential publisher, that is, Kremlev, as much as possible. I did not need to argue much about whether the text is authentic, and to prove its authenticity. I was able to immediately focus on the essence - on understanding the text and commenting on it. At the same time, the text provided the widest possibilities both for its analysis and for checking it - if desired - for authenticity. The chronology of the diaries, the abundance of specific facts, names, figures, historical circumstances, many assessments of certain figures or

197

events by L.P. Beria allow, in an objective analysis, to establish or reject authenticity with a high degree of probability.

If Kremlev had at least one photocopy of the original, then Kremlev, that is, I, would have to prove its authenticity (the authenticity of the photocopy, and not the information contained in it).

And if the Kremlin had only an electronic version of the text typed by someone, he could present to the judgment of compatriots and historians only the text itself, containing certain information, chronology and facts.

It was not the Kremlin who typed it, he did not find it – he was simply given the text without any formal guarantees of authenticity.

This, as I now understand, was the whole brilliance of the tactics of "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his comrades. They perspicaciously created a situation of the presumption of innocence around Beria's materials!

Now it was not Kremlev who was obliged to prove the authenticity of the text of the diaries (he made public what he was given), but critics and opponents of Kremlev had to prove the falsity of the diaries!

And prove it!

That is, firstly, comparing reliable data with the data of the text of the diaries in order to establish full compliance or, on the contrary, one or another inconsistency with historical data.

Only when certain inconsistencies are established, it is possible to speak with varying degrees of certainty about the partial or complete falsification of the text.

Secondly, critics and opponents of the Kremlin obya

198

zany were to compare the style of the diaries and the style of the texts, authentically published by Beria.

And until Kremlev's critics conclusively prove the falsity of the text of the diaries, on the basis of the principle of the presumption of innocence, the diaries should be considered authentic.

Unless, of course, in "democratic" "Russia", at least in historical science, the principle of the presumption of innocence operates.

That's what a powerful intellectual "cushion" provided me "Pavel Lavrentievich" and his comrades.

For which I am deeply grateful to them.

In a systemic sense, this was done flawlessly. The task of publishing the materials of L.P. Beria was divided into two. At the same time, the one who performed the first task could not adequately ensure the fulfillment of the second task, and vice versa.

The first task is to save the text in real time by photocopying with subsequent storage. At this stage, the materials were also translated into an impersonal electronic form, and this task ended with the simultaneous transfer of the materials to a person who is trustworthy and capable of preparing the materials for publication.

Thus, the "detuning" of the owners of the text from its commentator and publisher was carried out. This eliminated the need for the publisher (that is, for the Kremlin) to prove the authenticity of the texts, since I was a priori deprived of even the slightest formal opportunity to prove this authenticity. Evidence — according to the principle of the presumption of innocence — had to be provided by opponents.

199

The second task is the direct publication of texts, after which anyone gets the opportunity to analyze and criticize them - from sweeping and unsubstantiated to detailed and scrupulous.

I repeat that everything that I wrote above, I began to understand only after long reflections on the "duplicate" article by Professor Kozlov. And before her, I more than once racked my brains - why was the entire transfer of Beria's materials to me furnished the way it was furnished? I assumed something similar to what was written above, however, this version gained complete clarity, at least for myself, only thanks to that new impulse of doubts that Professor Kozlov's article generated.

Once again, on the advice of Marx, questioning the authenticity of the diaries from the standpoint of professor Kozlov, I eventually better understood the motives of "Pavel Lavrentievich" and the tactics of him and his comrades.

It must be assumed that the most experienced "Pavel Lavrentievich" foresaw in advance, so to speak, the "Professor Kozlov effect" and did not give him any chance to refute the authenticity of the diaries in any other way than by pointing out obvious factual signs of falsification of the diaries.

And since "Pavel Lavrentievich" knew that the diaries were genuine, he did not fear that Professor Kozlov could find revealing inaccuracies in the diaries.

Professor Kozlov did not find them, and even admitted it.

On the other hand, he embarked on lengthy and unsubstantiated "arguments".

And what could he do if there was no evidence?

A?

US theme

## ACADEMIC HISTORIANS AGAINST HISTORICAL TRUTH

And so we come to the last theme of this book.

Academic historians, without citing a single concrete evidence to support their assertions, announce the diaries of L.P. Beria forgery. And they themselves carry out forgery not only of the Stalin era, but, in a sense, of the entire Russian history.

On the other hand, 2012 has been officially declared the Year of Russian History. Declared at the highest level, so to speak, by Dmitry Medvedev's decree.

Like this:

### "DECRET OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION "ON HOLDING THE YEAR OF RUSSIAN HISTORY IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION"

In order to draw public attention to Russian history and the role of Russia in the world historical process, I decree:

1. To hold in 2012 in the Russian Federation the Year of Russian History.

2. To the Government of the Russian Federation:

201

— form an organizing committee for holding the Year of Russian History in the Russian Federation and approve its membership;

— to ensure the development and approval of a plan of key events for holding the Year of Russian History in the Russian Federation.

3. Recommend the executive authorities of the constituent entities of the Russian Federation to take the necessary measures within the framework of the Year of Russian History held in the Russian Federation.

4. This Decree comes into force from the date of its signing.

President of the Russian Federation Dmitry MEDVEDEV

Moscow Kremlin,

January 9, 2012

No. 49"

I am not very inclined to conspiracy theories, and the very word for me is abusive. I understand that the clerical paperwork process takes place daily, and each paper must have a number.

But Medvedev's decree is dated with a very "significant" number ...

After all, January 9th is the day of the execution by the tsarist troops of the peaceful and completely loyal march of St. Petersburg workers to the "tsar's chambers". This day entered the history of Russia under the name "Bloody Sunday".

So, was it really worth it to date such a seemingly "significant" Decree on January 9?

However, the level of knowledge of Russian history by the current "Russians" is such that the Kremlin apostle the parath might not have known about such an event as Bloody Sunday.

Or maybe he knew, and that's why he dated the decree like that?

And the number of the decree is also not without a hint:  $4 + 9 = 13$ .

But "13" is also a "significant" number for some people.

But this is so, by the way.

Another thing is more interesting - what is the glorious year of 2012 for, for example, the historical magazine "Rodina", the founders of which are the Government of the Russian Federation and the Administration of the President of the Russian Federation and which exposes the "falsifier of history" Kremlev?

Well, on the back cover of the magazine number 2 of 2012 (I remind you that Professor Kozlov's article was published in it) there is a message:

"2012 is:

- Pyotr Stolypin - 150

- Storm of the twelfth year

- 1150 years of Russian statehood - Russian military intelligence - 200.

This is how, it turns out, the main historical anniversaries of 2012 are seen by the government-presidential magazine.

And now - just offhand!

In 2012 it will be performed:

- 770 years since the Battle of the Ice on Lake Peipus (the date is not quite round, but it sounds like an effect - seven hundred and seventy years!);

- 90 years of the All-Union Pioneer Organization named after V.I. Lenin;

- 70 years since the completion of the 250-day defense of Sevastopol;

- 70 years since the beginning of the offensive of the Red Army near Stalingrad;

- 60 years since the 19th Congress of the CPSU, which renamed the party from the CPSU (b) into the CPSU and marked the completion of the post-war restoration of the national economy of the USSR;

- 50 years of the Caribbean crisis, which marked the beginning of an era of nuclear stability;

- 50 years since the world's first group space flight of the Vostok-3 and Vostok-4 spacecraft piloted by Chuvash Andriyan Nikolaev and Ukrainian Pavel Popovich.

Finally, and this date is objectively the main one in 2012, 2012 is the year of the 90th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

However, not only about this great date, but even about the 400th anniversary of the expulsion of the Polish interventionists from Moscow by the people's militia under the leadership of Kozma Minin and Dmitry Pozharsky, the current officialdom has forgotten.

Or is it still "forgotten" in quotation marks?

After all, the very word "intervention" is becoming taboo for the current Kremlin in our time, when the systemic intervention of the West has been successfully carried out in Russia for two decades now.

Or maybe the current academic historians about the 400th anniversary of the great national triumph "didn't know but forgot"?

Well, with our current "academicians" this option is not excluded. And should they be reminded of such, for example, "trifle" anniversaries of 2012 as the 300th anniversary of the creation of weapons

204

yard in Tula and the Foundry yard in St. Petersburg, 250th anniversary of the beginning of the reign of Catherine the Great, 200th anniversary of the annexation of Bessarabia to Russia, 150th anniversary of the start of military reform D.N. Milyutin?

Not to mention the 100th anniversary of the Lena massacre and the 50th anniversary of the introduction of the death penalty in the USSR for bribery on an especially large scale ...

In issue 5 of the journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences "Voprosy istorii" for 2012, p. 23 is the thought of the German philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002):

"To think historically means now to recognize for each epoch its own right to existence, even her own perfection."

Well said, but it is the modern academic historians themselves who demonstrate their complete inability and unwillingness to think historically, denying the Stalin era not only perfection, but also in its own right to exist.

They try to present the era of Lenin and Stalin as a kind of historical nonsense, a kind of a misunderstanding allegedly committed because the "damned Bolsheviks" managed to deceive trusting Russian people.

But in reality, the people of Russia have been deceived and are deceived by the current Kremlin the inhabitants are registered anti-communists and anti-Soviet. And academic historians help them.

The same author of the article in No. 5 of Questions of History, who quotes Gadamer, a certain Candidate of Historical Sciences Soroko-Tsyupa, writes without hesitation:

"Changes in the world, taking place before our eyes, testify to the formation and development of new historical era. This requires not only an understanding of the ongoing processes and phenomena... but also a new reading of the previous stages of historical development... However, this does not mean that history is being rewritten to suit the needs and needs of today..."

Well, in relation to the current "Rossiania" we can agree that the history of the era Stalin today in "Rossiyanija" really does not correspond.

The true history of the USSR in "Rossiyanija" - if we have in mind the semi-official "historical" "science" - is totally ignored and hushed up to please the needs and needs of today's fundamentally illiterate rulers, who assure fellow citizens that the USSR did not export de nothing but "galoshes for Africans."

Such statements are not only ignorant, vile and deceitful. They are also totally ahistorical.

So the candidate of sciences Soroko-Tsyupa anti-historically asserts that "... the third system of international relations (counted from the First and Second World Wars. - S.K.) was formed as a result of not military, but fundamental social changes in the world, when 28 countries embarked on the path of democratic transformations...».

It is Soroko-Tsyupa who speaks in such a delicate way about the counter-revolution in the USSR and other former socialist countries. And further states:

"Thus, war cannot be a universal criterion for distinguishing periods in recent history..."

Sorry! And how is this to be understood?

It turns out that a professional historian, who claims to have a new understanding of the contemporary era, does not understand that the now formed (and hardly, by the way, stable and durable) system of international relations, so dear to the heart of Soroko-Tsyupa, has developed in the result of a war, but a special war, where not direct, but indirect military operations are carried out?

The third in a row (our "democrat" was not mistaken in the calculations) the newest system of international relations was formed after such fundamental social (more precisely, anti-social) changes in the world, which became the result of the Third World War! And this war differed from the first two world wars only in that its main stages were not "hot", but "cold" in nature.

Moreover, if in the Second World War the peoples won, whatever one may say, then in the Third World War, as in the First World War, the egoistic supranational golden elite won.

Without understanding this, to call for comprehension of what is happening?

Oh well...

Official academic historians deal with facts that are inconvenient or destroy their false "concepts" in the same way as Admiral Nelson did in those cases when he did not want to see what he did not want to see. He simply put a spyglass to his gouged eye, covered with a black bandage, and quite sincerely declared: "I don't see anything."

Here, for example, is already well known to the reader

Professor Kozlov... 207

I already wrote that, having singled out the diaries of L.P. Beria three "informational" "layers" directly in the text of the diaries, Professor Kozlov actually silenced the presence in three volumes of the fourth informational layer - comments, notes and supplementary essays by the publisher of Beria's diaries, that is, Sergei Kremlev.

That is, me.

I already wrote that, oddly enough, Professor Kozlov did not react in any way to the reliable, but hushed up historical information that I cite.

My comments drew a quite definite and generally unambiguously positive and attractive image of the era of Stalin, personally Stalin and Beria, however, Professor Kozlov, challenging the authenticity of the diaries directly, did not even try to challenge the vision of the era of Stalin and Beria, which is stated in my comments and essays attached to Beria's diaries.



I have already wondered, "Why did Professor Kozlov prefer to remain silent about all this?" and promised to talk in more detail on this topic later.

This is what we're talking about right now.

When considering the topic of the fourth "There is nothing to blame on Beria, if Katyn is a lie," I have already partially cited the final paragraph of Professor Kozlov's article. Now the time has come to once again remind the reader about him (not Professor Kozlov, but a paragraph), quote it in full and comment on it.

So Professor Kozlov concluded his supposedly revealing article with the following passage:

"The task of this review does not include an assessment of the most difficult period in our history associated with the name of Stalin. Here, whatever event or phenomenon, it is not only methodology or ideology, but also such universal concepts as morality and morality,

The last two concepts are related not only to the era of Stalin, but to our time.

Absolutely, Professor, absolutely!

That's just, speaking of morality and morality in relation to the era of Stalin and Beria, we must admit that this era had its own morality and morality. Yes, these were often harsh (although not uncommonly cheerful) morality and strict morality, without bare-chested (still naked on top) passers-by on the streets of Moscow.

And speaking of morality and morality in relation to the era of Putin and Chubais, it must be admitted that this era has neither morality nor morality. That is, it is immoral and immoral, moreover it is immoral and immoral on all steps of the social "ladder", but especially on its upper steps.

Do Professor Kozlov and his RAS colleagues agree with this statement?

I'm sure not.

And I think I know why they disagree with him.

That is why Professor Kozlov is silent, for example, about my comments on the diaries of L.P. Beria, that the information given in these comments is already rehabilitating the era of Stalin and Beria!

Bearing in mind the diaries of L.P. Beria, Professor Kozlov states:

"This false documentary historical source is dangerous in that it introduces asymmetry into the documentary heritage of the history of the USSR and, ultimately, is also its falsification."

But, while stating this, my opponent could not refute a single fact or judgment from L.P. Beria, nor from the comments to them.

As for the concerns of Professor Kozlov and those like him regarding the fact that the appearance in the mass public consciousness of the diaries of L.P. Beria is dangerous because it introduces asymmetry into the documentary heritage of the history of the USSR?

Well, these "anxieties" remind me, to put it bluntly, of a prostitute's "anxiety" about whether she would seem too accessible if she exposed not three-quarters of her breasts, but four-fifths at once before going on the panel ...

It is not for professors kozlovs to worry about the correct coverage and representation in the public consciousness of their history - after all, and theirs, too - of the Motherland.

I am not referring to the Rodina magazine, but to that Soviet Motherland, whose history the semi-official Rodina magazine continually slings mud at.

By the way, in the more "academic" version of the article published in the journal Questions of History, the paragraph cited above has a slightly more "restrained" look.

Namely:

"This 'source' is dangerous because it compromises  
documentary heritage of the history of the USSR by falsification".

Compromising?

Oh well...

It turns out that an obvious, more than once convincingly, multi-layered exposed, "Katyn" fake document  
210

the mental heritage of the history of the USSR is not compromised by falsification, according to Professor Kozlov.

But the diaries of L.P. Beria, whose authenticity Professor Kozlov "refutes" without citing a single fact to support his assertion, does it mean that they are compromising?

Or maybe, against the background of this new documentary, albeit in a really unusual way introduced into circulation, the source is more clearly revealed, so to speak, "compromising evidence" on modern semi-official falsifiers of the history of the USSR?

The final lines in the two versions of the article (in Rodina and Voprosy istorii) are also slightly different. In the "academic" version of Questions of History, which came out after the first publication in Rodina magazine, the article ends like this:

"However, for a historian, Kremlev's work has some significance as one of the monuments of ideology — the justification of Stalinism in our time, dictated by the desire to recommend to the modern leadership of Russia the means already tested in practice by this most "effective" Stalinist manager ".

In Rodina magazine, however, the "final" of Professor Kozlov's article was written in more emotional and more careless (careless for Professor Kozlov from the standpoint of his self-disclosure) tones:

"However, for an inquisitive (well, well. - S.K.) historian, Beria's "Personal Diary" retains its source value as one of the documentary evidence of

211

the glory of Stalinism in our time. And what a desire (God forbid) to offer the modern leadership of Russia the means to achieve the goal of modernizing Russia, which were probably used by the most effective Stalinist manager."

I must say that it was with this "final" - in the Rodina magazine - that Professor Kozlov struck me, as they say, on the spot. It was the last phrase that struck me. And I did not know whether I should die of laughter, or of amazement.

That's what I could not imagine even in a feverish delirium, even in a terrible nightmare, is that someone can regard my work in preparing for the publication of L.P.'s diaries. Berry so...

That is, as "the desire to offer the modern leadership of Russia" certain "means of modernizing Russia."

Consider the current Kremlin and Okhotno-Ryad "prisoners" as the leadership of Russia? ..

Compare the modern "leadership" of "Russia" with Stalin and the Stalinist leadership?

Why, Herr Professor, this is not even for chickens to laugh at!

It's not even "where a horse with a hoof, there is a crayfish with a claw", it's "where a horse with a hoof, there is a bug with a paw" ...

To assume that the Kremlin is asleep and sees in a dream, how would it be "to offer the modern leadership of Russia the means to achieve the goal of modernizing Russia"?..

Herr Professor Kozlov takes me for a nerd?

Whom to offer?

212

It's not even about the wall with peas.

And even - not against the wall forehead ...

And even - not a stone in the swamp!

Well, yes, at the end of his article Academic Herr Professor Kozlov amused me, amused me!

Even DM. Winter didn't make me so happy.

And this is what I must also say at the end of my little book.

In a historical situation, when powerful anti-social forces — from presidents to school teachers — slander the era of Stalin and Beria, when they totally falsify it, any means of drawing the attention of fellow citizens to historical truth are acceptable and correct in principle.

If we are talking about historical truth, of course!

Again, I emphasize that what has just been written from here does not mean my indirect recognition that Beria's Diaries were actually written by me, that they are the result of my "creative efforts" or, as the same Herr Professor Kozlov puts it, the result of my "intellect".

My above statement is simply meant to emphasize both some of the long-standing abnormalities of the current "epoch" and the fact that these anti-historical and anti-social abnormalities justify any action if they serve to reveal the true "historical essence of our of the past.

As for the specific diaries of Beria, their publication is, of course, the result of considerable personal work of mine. But the result is only in the sense that without my considerable previous work on the Beria theme, without my voluminous book about Love

213

Rentii Pavlovich Beria would not have been my meeting with "Pavel Lavrentievich", the result of which was the acquisition of the text of the diaries.

A distinction has long been made between the spirit of the law and the letter of the law. Alas, in our time of total falsification of history (and not only in Russia, practically the whole world is actively engaged in this), it would be time to introduce the concepts of "spirit of history" and "letter of history".

It is my deep conviction that what is more important today is the correct understanding of society, and above all of its young generations, of the "spirit of history."

After all, it is more difficult to distort the letter of history. Whatever one may say, but Napoleon entered Russia precisely in 1812, the Great Patriotic War began precisely on June 22, 1941, etc.

But even by truncating the full name of the last war, one can distort the spirit of the era, and fundamentally distort it. The full name of our great war is "The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the Nazi invaders"... Remove the word "Soviet" from this name and the spirit of history is distorted.

Malicious!

Namely, today, before the eyes of History, its enemies are doing it. And the vilely draped Mausoleum on the day of the shameful imitation of the great Victory Parade is a clear illustration of this.

How many copies have been broken lately in order to prove the supposed falsity of Churchill's words that "Stalin accepted Russia with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb"... Articles and almost monographs have been written, proving that Churchill said nothing of the sort.

Well, don't let him say that. Let it be a forgery in form. And in terms of content, in fact?

214

Does the striking style of the assertion that Stalin accepted Russia with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb, correspond to historical truth?

Without a doubt - yes!

But does the "statement" that Stalin and Beria were supposedly executioners and tyrants who allegedly covered Russia with blood correspond to historical truth, vile in form and content?

Without a doubt - no!

Every historian knows this, at least to himself. Otherwise, he simply does not know history and does not know how to adequately operate with historical information.

By the way, a small test of civic and professional maturity for Professor Kozlov and his colleagues... I invite them and everyone who wants to honestly answer the question: "Does the assertion that the current inhabitants of the Kremlin accepted Russia correspond to historical truth? with an atomic bomb, but they are taking her back to the plow?"

uh?

Completing his work on preparing for publication the third volume of L.P. Beria, in his essay "Beria as a Man" wrote (I apologize to the reader for the second extensive autoquotation, but it is simply necessary here):

"Beginning to work on preparing the diaries for publication, I asked myself the question: are these diaries or is it still a literary and historical hoax? But, even after completing the voluminous work on the analysis and preparation of the diaries of L.P. Beria for publication, I could not give an unambiguous answer to this question.  
response.

However...

However, I must confess that at some point the question lost its initial sharpness for me. Be that as it may, are we dealing with genuine diaries

215

Lavrenty Pavlovich or with their skillful forgery by the mysterious "Pavel Lavrentievich" or someone else – the text of the diaries adequately reflects the events of that era, its essence and the personality of L.P. Beria.

I don't know if Beria wrote the text of his diaries, but I'm sure that in any case, if Lavrenty Pavlovich had kept a diary, he would have looked about the same.

As for me, as a result of my work, I better understood the nature of L.P. Beria and his time. I hope that the reader will be able to say the same, having already completed his work, the work of reading the diaries, as well as my notes and comments on them. I can fully vouch for their historical authenticity!

...From the diary entries of L.P. Beria, it is clear that the inner world of their author was filled primarily with those specific tasks that Stalin and Russia set before him. Yes, Beria has always lived in business. Moreover, like Stalin, the construction of the State was for him not only a state, official and moral duty, but also his only, so to speak, hobby ...

This is what I wrote over a year ago.

Now, after all the collisions around Beria's diaries, after the obscure "anti-diary" publications in two status official journals, after the forced confessions of the publishers of investigative materials on the "Beria case" regarding the role of the diaries in declassifying the "Beria case", I declare with much greater certainty that Beria's diaries are not a fake!

After their publication, all the anti-historical, falsifying riff-raff fussed too nervously, she was too worried that Beria's diaries would turn out to be a forgery, deliberately slipped to me.

216

It seems that there were, were in the archives the diaries of L.P. Beria!

Yes, but the originals have long been destroyed.

And their text, as we see, has been preserved!

And they, the diaries of L.P. Beria, do not falsify the era of Stalin, but reconstruct it - in contrast to the current historical, or rather, anti-historical officialdom.

And last...

As mentioned earlier, 2012 has been officially declared the Year of Russian History.

Well, let's assume that I also made my contribution to the events of this Year. Although, as I guess, not in the way that the organizers of this Year would like, in a way.

Afterword

This afterword will be short.

At the beginning of the book, I wrote that the professor and Corresponding Member. Kozlov, wittingly or unwittingly, touched upon a number of points about which he would have been better off keeping silent.

In the house of the hanged man, they don't talk about the rope, but in the "temples" of academic historical "science", both entire historical epochs and individual historical facts that are inconvenient for the current regime and objectionable to it are executed every now and then.

In a house with glass walls, it is unreasonable to throw stones at someone - after all, you can accidentally break the walls. And the current semi-official "historians" now and then throw stones at Lenin, Stalin, Beria ...

So, how would you not break, gentlemen, at the same time your fragile glass "house" with "walls" smeared with dirty lies.

R.5.

It turned out that this book should also have a postscript...

Having already sent the manuscript to the publishing house, on the evening of June 8, 2012, I accidentally stumbled upon the pro-tram of the Ren-TV channel "Strange Business" ...

First, an announcer's voice, and then a certain lady, presented as a "historian" Irina Ser

218

gievskaya, told "strange" and terrible things.

Allegedly, every midnight on the Moscow street leading to the former Beria's mansion on Malaya Nikitskaya, two bright points of light appear ...

And on the way to the mansion pulls up a huge black limousine.

True, no one sees him - they only hear him, but the "historian" Irina Sergievskaya, or whatever she is, assures that the limousine is black, and its noise is "exactly like that of Beria's."

Then the "historian" lady with a touch of exaltation, either dressed in an infernal crimson robe, or infernally illuminated, with falsely "confiding" intonations, tells the public even more supposedly "miracles"...

Like, when the noise of the limousine subsides, a passer-by who finds himself at the mansion can hear female voices, laughter, and sometimes crying. These are, they say, echoes of the unfortunate fates of young girls, who allegedly were brought here in "packs" for the needs of the voluptuous "bloody marshal" after he "looked out for them from the podium of the Mausoleum"...

Then footage of some earthworks was shown, a small pile (strange - why not a mountain ?!) of human bones removed from the earth, and it was announced that these were the remains of once missing girls, who, it turns out, were deprived in Beria's mansion, not only innocence, but life itself.

And that such unfortunates, "according to some information," number up to a thousand souls...

Vile?

Yes!

Lying?

Undoubtedly.

219

In addition, this anti-historical anti-Beria Sabbath is also painted in terry obscurantist colors.

Let me remind you that the concept of "obscurantism" comes from the Latin "obscurapulus" or "opsigapiis" ("obscuring"), which is very suitable for assessing the social atmosphere that reigned in Rossiyanii.

"Obscurantism" is obscurantism, it is an extremely hostile and intolerant attitude towards science and enlightenment, it is the assertion of the most monstrous superstitions.

Oh, how exactly the now half-forgotten and hushed-up concept fits your "activities", gentlemen, semi-official obscurantist "historians" from the "Russian" Academy of "Sciences"!

Blackouts is about you.

"It is you who are obscuring the epoch, and it is you who allow and obscure the mass public new consciousness.

And is it possible to define such behavior differently than criminal?

Every day, every evening, on almost every television channel, your "colleagues" in introducing the mood of obscurantism into the life of society are engaged in obscuring minds and souls and casting a dirty shadow on the bright Soviet past.

And nothing - no indignation on the part of Corresponding Member Kozlov and various other members of various "academies"!

No statements, no articles exposing obvious anti-Soviet, anti-Stalinist and anti-Beria fakes.

Well...

220

Humanity has been waiting for centuries for the coming of the Antichrist, and it seems that it has.

I don't mean, of course, the obscurantist tales about the "prophecies" of various ancient calendars predicting the end of the world as early as 2012...

I mean the Antichrist with a checkbook in his pocket, playing with the future of mankind, not in a sulphurous Hell, but on the New York Stock Exchange.

However, if we turn to the biblical allusion, then it does not hurt to remind everyone that the Last Judgment follows the era of Antichrist only as an intermediate stage. Finally, the old history of the world and mankind ends with the affirmation of the highest truth of the new Holy City.

And with the approval of a new order of things in a new — just — world, a new history of Man will begin.

Oh, how long ago it was said:

".. Its gates will not be locked during the day, and the night will not be there.

And they will bring glory and honor to the nations!

And nothing unclean will enter into it, and no one given over to abomination and falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life..."

So, gentlemen, semi-official "historians", keep in mind that you will not enter under the Gates of a new just world for anything and never!

## Content

Theme T

Not a forgery, but a document. Answer to Professor and Corresponding Member Kozlov. .... 13

Topic P A little bit about the book "Stalin and Beria are war criminals", as well as about "activists" from the Internet... .....82 Topic III Unfunny "detectives" by Veniamin Smekhov.

Self interview experience. .... 0...0... 117 Topic GU Nech to blame Beria, if Katyn is a lie. .... 129 The topic of the University "Quiet Flows the Don" by Mikhail Sholokhov and the "Diaries" of Beria ... 144 The topic of the UT "The Case of Beria" and the affairs of the "democrats"..... 162 Theme of the UE Why Beria's diaries were handed over to the Kremlin in such a way

how they were transferred. .... 192 Topic VS Academician historians against the historical truth. .... 201 Afterword... eeee kan myin 218

Literary and artistic edition

SPETSHRAN. SENSATIONAL MEMOIRS

Kremlev Sergey

BERIA'S DIARY IS NOT A FAKE! New evidence

Managing editor L. Nezvinskaya Art editor S. Kurbatov Technical editor V. Kulagina Computer proofing S. Kladoy Proofreader L. Nikiforova

LLC "Yauza-press" 109439, Moscow, Volgogradsky pr-t, 120, bldg. 2 Tel.: (495) 745-58-23, fax: 411-68-86-2253.

Signed for printing on 02.08.2012. Format 84x108 1/32. Headset "Journal". Offset printing. Conv. oven l. 11.76. Circulation 3000 copies. Order 4884/12

Printed in accordance with the materials provided by IPK Pareto-Print LLC, Tver, mmm pareo-rgipz.gi

1SVM 978-5-3955-0457-3

IPI,

for 1938-1953 with Sergey Kremlev's commentary caused not only furious controversy on the Internet, but also a violent reaction from the historical officialdom, which hastened to declare these records a "fake" and "hoax", and their publisher ~ a "forger".

Raising the thrown glove, Kremlev takes on a head-on battle - and not only repulses all the attacks of the accusers, leaving no stone unturned from their "arguments" and providing new evidence of the authenticity of Beria's diaries, but he himself goes on the offensive against the Kremlin agitprop, incriminating the "membership mafia" in the deliberate falsification of Soviet history, the forgery of the great Stalin era and the deliberate denigration of the Leader's closest comrade-in-arms:

"As head of the NKVD, Beria paid much attention to the organization of archives, constantly emphasizing that without documents there are no archives, without archives there is no history, and without history there is no future. Beria created historical archives. Slanderers on Beria destroy historical archives. And they replace documents with fakes like the Katyn case ... "



“Stalin and Beria accepted Russia with a plow, and left it with an atomic bomb. The current regime will leave us not only without a nuclear shield, but even without a plow...”

VOLUME

9785995 5 M. "YAUZA-PRESS"